

CITY OF VERONA 2010 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

CHAPTER EIGHT—LAND USE

**Adopted by the City of Verona Common Council
September 14th, 2009**



Prepared by the City of Verona Comprehensive Plan Committee

City of Verona Comprehensive Plan—2010

Table of Contents—Chapter 8—Land Use

Section One—Introduction

Comprehensive Plan Survey Results
Definitions Used in this Chapter

Section Two—Existing Conditions—Current City of Verona

2-1: Amount, type, intensity, and intensity of existing land uses
2-2: Density of Residential Land Uses
2-3: Detailed amount, type, and intensity of land uses
2-4: Land use changes since 2000
2-5: Analysis of annexations
2-6: Analysis of trends in the supply, demand, and price of land

Section Three—Existing Conditions—Perimeter Area

3-1: Amount, type, intensity, and intensity of existing land uses
3-2: Density of Residential Land Uses
3-3: Detailed amount, type, and intensity of land uses
3-4: Land use changes since 2000
3-5: Analysis of annexations
3-6: Analysis of trends in the supply, demand, and price of land

Section Four—Projections

Section Five—Future Plans/Current City

5-1: Land Use Plan for Non-Urbanized Areas within the Current City of Verona
5-2: Land Use Plan for Downtown

Section Six—Future Plans/Perimeter Area

6-1: Definition of the ‘Perimeter’ Area & Classification of Existing Uses in the Perimeter Area
6-2: Land Use Plan for *Future Urban Areas* within the ‘Perimeter’ Area
6-2A: Southwest Neighborhood Plan
6-3: Land Use Plan for *Rural and Farmland Preservation Areas* within the ‘Perimeter’ Area

Section Seven—Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs for Chapter 8—Land Use

Appendices

Section One—Introduction

Land-use regulations are inescapably the tense interface between individual property rights and broader community and public purposes—the classic ‘public-private’ debate. Further adding to the tension of creating and implementing land-use regulations is the fact that there is tension and conflict even within the sub-components of the ‘public versus private’ debate; or in other words, there is almost always tension within the ‘public versus public’ debate and the ‘private versus private’ debate for any given question of how land should be used.

What is an example of a ‘public versus public’ debate? One example may make the point: advocates for a corridor for high-voltage electric transmission lines may cite economic development and regional/global competitiveness concerns to support such a corridor while opponents cite environmental and natural preservation concerns to oppose it. This example is a land-use debate—will a corridor of land be allowed to be used for high-voltage transmission lines or not? But as this example illustrates—there is often disagreement regarding the *public* goals regarding a particular land-use question.

This example also illustrates the ‘private versus private’ debate. How does the desire of a property owner (such as a farmer...) who wishes to lease land for several of the transmission line towers reconcile with the desire of a near-by property owner who opposes the erection of the towers and lines?

These same ‘public-private’; ‘public-public’; and ‘private-private’ tensions run through *all* land-use discussions. Not a week goes by in Dane County where these debates are not front-and-center in the local news and on the agendas of local units of government, covering everything from affordable housing, new urbanism, redevelopment, annexation, and environmental protection and everything in between. Land-use regulations are complicated by a wide variety of related, intertwined and often conflicting issues.

The fundamental idea underlying *all* land-use regulations in the State of Wisconsin—including this Land Use Chapter of the City of Verona’s comprehensive plan—is that *how* land will be used—down to the level of specific and individual pieces of land—is to be determined by the community at large rather than by the owner of any particular piece of land. This concept is as true for the city property owner who may wish to sell cars in the front yard of her house in a residential neighborhood—and who is told that the community has determined that such use of her land is not allowed—as it is true of the town property owner who may wish to subdivide his land for low-intensity urban development—and who is told that the community has determined that such development of his land is not allowed. This fundamental idea bears repeating—it is the community that determines how land will be used. While the community decides how land is to be used, the decisions a community makes must not deny individual owners of property the use of their property, unless they are justly compensated, and so property owner rights must be respected as a community creates land-use regulations to achieve community-determined goals and purposes.

This notion that the public will decide how land is to be used was solidified by the State of Wisconsin legislature when it passed the law requiring all communities within the State—including Verona—to create and adopt comprehensive plans that specify *how* land will be used. Because the issue of ‘how land will be used’ is so important, the state has required all communities to come-up with land-use plans that are thoughtfully created, comprehensive in scope, and based on long-term rather than short term considerations. Once these important plans are created—the land-use decisions a community makes—from rezonings to annexations to land divisions—must be consistent with the plan that the community creates and adopts. It is to satisfy this state requirement that this City of Verona Land Use plan is being created as Chapter 8 of our comprehensive plan.

City Survey Results

Between 2006 and 2009, the City mailed out three Comprehensive Planning surveys. These surveys included multiple questions that are directly or indirectly related to land-use planning for Verona's future. These questions included 1 growth-related land-use question; 4 housing-related land-use questions; 6 economic development-related land-use questions; 1 farmland preservation question; and 5 questions related specifically to land use planning issues:

Growth:

- A majority (55%) of the survey respondents thought that the City was growing too fast;

Housing:

- 89% of survey respondents felt the city should *continue* to limit the number of single-family houses that are allowed annually as a means to control and regulate growth of the city;
- 92% of survey respondents felt that multi-family housing should similarly be limited as a means to control and regulate growth of the city;
- The survey also asked about the type of housing pattern that they supported. The largest group supported a mix of low density and higher density housing types. Respondents supported single-family housing as the predominant type of residential development.
- When asked what kind of housing should be built in Verona, the respondents were split into five groups. However, housing for middle-income households was the most popular category and housing for poor families was the least popular.

Economic Development:

- Survey respondents expressed a preference for efforts to attract and support locally-owned small businesses first and office parks and corporate campuses second, followed by small chain stores/franchises, industrial businesses, and lastly national big-box retailers;
- Insuring that affordable housing was available for the local workforce was rated as a higher priority to promote economic development than was offering incentives to businesses such as TIF funding or reducing requirements for architecturally attractive buildings;
- 60% of survey respondents did not support the use of city resources such as Tax Increment Financing to support *privately-owned* industrial parks as a method to promote local economic development;
- 53% of survey respondents did not support the use of city resources such as Tax Increment Financing to support *publicly-owned* industrial parks as a method to promote local economic development;
- 63% of survey respondents felt that the city has approved enough 'big-box' retail development within the community and no further big-box developments should be approved;
- 62% of survey respondents felt that new retail development should not be limited to just the downtown, Verona Avenue, and Main Street but should be allowed outside of the downtown area as well.

Farmland Preservation:

- When asked "Should land-use conflicts between farming and new development in rural areas be prevented through limits on residential development in rural areas?" 75% stated "Yes, farming and rural land uses should be protected from new development in rural areas" while 25% responded "No, new housing and other development should be allowed in rural areas."

Land-Use

- 63% of survey respondents stated “Verona’s downtown and Verona Avenue should be promoted as the city’s ‘commercial center’ and new businesses should be discouraged outside of these areas”, while 37% stated “New businesses should be encouraged on the outside edge of the city rather than downtown and along Verona Avenue”;
- 61% of survey respondents preferred “Remove on-street parking during rush-hour to ease traffic congestion, even if it makes North Main more like a highway”, while 39% preferred “Continue to allow on-street parking to slow-down traffic, even if it creates congestion”;
- 46% of survey respondents stated “Additional parking is needed and the city should help create additional parking areas”, while 54% stated “There is sufficient parking in the downtown already”
- When asked if condominiums, townhouses, apartments, and similar higher-density housing in the downtown area should be ‘encouraged’ or ‘discouraged’, 51% chose “Discouraged” and 49% chose “Encouraged”;
- When asked “Should city tax dollars be used to purchase lands along the Sugar River to prevent development along this river”, 54% responded “Yes, it is worthwhile to use city tax dollars to keep development away from this river”, while 46% responded “No, development should be allowed near the Sugar River as long as it complies with environmental regulations.”

For complete information about the survey’s used as part of creating this comprehensive plan—including complete survey results—please see [Appendix 1-F](#).

Definitions Used in this Chapter

The language and the words used for ‘land use planning’ are too often vague, imprecise, confusing, emotionally-charged, and generally unhelpful. Too often—one word means different things to different people. To assist in promoting clear and precise discussion about land use planning in the Verona Area, the following ‘definitions’ section provides meanings for the words used in this chapter.

Developed. Land that has been altered by human beings to serve human needs. Two basic types of development exist—rural development and urban development (See definitions). ‘Developed’ is the opposite of ‘Natural’.

Development. Altering land for human purposes to serve human needs for matters such as food production, shelter, commerce, industry, entertainment etc.... Land that is developed is typically ‘served’ by infrastructure such as roads, wells and septic tanks, and water mains and sewers. There are two primary types of development—Rural and Urban.

Development, Rural. Altering land for rural land uses (See Land Uses—Rural). Rural lands may be—and often are—intensively developed. Examples include plowing, tilling and planting of food or other crops; installation of drain tile or irrigation systems or similar *agricultural* infrastructure; mining gravel or other materials, or raising animals for milk, food or wool. The vast majority of rural development in the Verona Area is for agriculture, with lesser amounts of rural development being for other rural land-uses such as gravel mining (See Land Uses—Rural). Rural development typically does *not* require the division of land. Roads are typically the only primary infrastructure required for rural development (See ‘Infrastructure—Primary’). With the exception of residential uses that are *accessory* to rural development—rural development does not require ‘Services’. (See ‘Service/Served’ and ‘Residential’)

Development, Urban. Altering land for *non-rural* land uses (See ‘Development—Rural’ and ‘Land Uses—Rural’...). Urban development requires the division of land to allow land-uses which do not require large amounts of land and which can be accommodated on less than 35 acres of land. Examples include the construction of residential, commercial, or industrial buildings. In addition to requiring land division, urban development also requires the installation of primary infrastructure (See Infrastructure—Primary) systems necessary to ‘serve’ the development (See ‘Service/Served’).

Urban development is a *continuum*, ranging from ‘low intensity’ to ‘high intensity’:

Development—Urban—Low-Intensity. Land that is altered for non-rural land uses *and that is not* served by public utilities (See ‘Utilities/Urban Services’). In general—low-intensity urban development is urbanization that is ‘served’ by private well and septic. (See ‘Service/Served’). In the Verona Area, low-intensity urban development is primarily for residential land-uses (See ‘Rural Residential’), although scattered examples of low-intensity urban development for commercial, institutional, and industrial land-uses do exist. Low-intensity urban parcels are parcels 35 acres in size or smaller. This plan utilizes the term ‘Low-intensity urban development’ to describe land-uses that are not rural in nature—as the term ‘rural’ is defined below and as it is used in this report—but which nonetheless occur *outside* of areas characterized by high-intensity urban development. The most common example of ‘Low-intensity urbanization’ is often labeled as ‘rural residential’ by county zoning regulations, land-use plans from other governmental jurisdictions, and often by realtors and by the general public. By using the term ‘low-intensity urbanization’ *rather than* the more common term ‘rural residential’, this plan seeks to clearly differentiate between land uses that are truly rural in nature (as defined below), and those that—despite commonly being described as ‘rural’—are in fact a form of urbanization.

Development—Urban—High Intensity. Land that is altered for non-rural land uses *and that is* served by public utilities (See ‘Utilities/Urban Services’). In general—high-intensity urban development is urbanization that results in development that is ‘served’ by municipal water mains and sanitary sewer systems including sewer mains and sewage treatment plants (See ‘Service/Served’). High-intensity urban development typically covers significant areas of a parcel with building(s) and pavement. In the Verona Area, high-intensity urban development is for residential, commercial, and industrial land uses.

Infrastructure—Primary. Facilities for a) streets; b) potable water provision; and c) treatment of human waste. Street primary infrastructure for low-intensity urbanization and for high-intensity urbanization is very similar, although streets serving high-intensity urban development typically include pipes for storm water management and curbs while streets serving low-intensity urban (and rural) development typically include ditches for storm water management and no curbs. Potable water for high-intensity urban development is typically provided by municipal (public) water systems while potable water for low-intensity urban (and rural) development is typically provided by private wells. Treatment of human waste for high-intensity urbanization is typically provided by municipal (public) sanitary sewer and waste water treatment facilities while treatment for human waste for low-intensity urbanization is typically provided by (private) septic systems.

Infrastructure—Secondary. Facilities for public safety, fire protection, emergency medical service, schools, libraries, recreation, and other human needs that arise from both low-intensity and high-intensity urbanization.

Land Division. Dividing a parcel of land into smaller parcels of land by a subdivision plat, certified survey map, condominium, deed, or other method.

Land Use—Accessory. Use of land that is not the principal/primary use of the land. For example—a farmhouse is residential use of land that is *accessory* to the primary use of agriculture.

Land Use—Rural. A land use that meets one of two criteria: 1) A land-use which relies on the land itself and which requires large amounts of land, typically 35 acres or more. Examples of rural land-uses include: crop agriculture, animal husbandry, tree nurseries, managed forests, and mineral extraction. 2) A land-use which does not necessarily require large amounts of land but which creates or has the potential to create conflicts with urban development (See Development—Urban...) and which is therefore inappropriate in an urban area. Examples include: crop agriculture, animal husbandry, mineral extraction*, land-fills, shooting ranges, agricultural products processing or storage facilities, high-voltage electrical transmission lines, and outdoor kennel facilities. Housing is not a rural land-use in and of itself *unless it is accessory to a rural land use* as defined here (See ‘Residential Accessory to Rural Land Uses’ under ‘Residential’). Rural land-uses do not typically require the division of land.

* Note—the City will consider mineral extraction uses *within* the city on a case-by-case basis...

Land Use—Urban. A land use which can typically be accommodated on a parcel of land smaller than 35 acres in size. Examples of urban land-uses include: Housing independent of (not accessory to) a rural land-use, commerce, and industry. A small handful of urban land-uses, such as large manufacturing facilities and corporate campuses, require more than 35 acres of land even though they are urban land uses. Urban land uses can be developed at either ‘high-intensity’ or ‘low-intensity’, depending on the availability of utilities. See ‘Utilities/Urban Services’, ‘Development—Urban’, and ‘Infrastructure’.

Natural Area/Natural. See ‘Undeveloped’.

Perimeter Area. The area and lands located within three (3) miles of the municipal limits of the City of Verona. These areas/lands are planned to be included within the City's extraterritorial jurisdiction during the period of time covered by this plan. See **Map 8-4** for the Perimeter Area. Note that as annexations to the City occur, the 'perimeter area' will expand accordingly.

Preservation. Two types of preservation are addressed in this plan. 'Farmland Preservation' is the preservation of lands for agricultural development such as crop lands, managed forests, or mineral extraction. These areas will be *developed with rural land-uses*. 'Natural Areas Preservation' is the preservation of areas with NO development, such as a nature preserve or prairie restoration area. These areas will *not be developed with rural land-uses* but will rather be undeveloped.

Residential. A land-use characterized by buildings used primarily for people to live in as opposed to buildings in which people primarily conduct business or other activities. Residential land-uses are an *urban* land use unless they are *accessory* to a rural land use, regardless of a) the size of the parcel and b) the land-uses on other parcels in the immediate vicinity.

Residential Uses Accessory to Rural Land Uses. Houses located on parcels of land larger than 35 acres in size and used for rural land-uses are considered to be 'rural' land-uses.

Example: A single-family house on a 15 acre parcel that is surrounded by farm fields is *not* a 'rural' land-use if the bulk of the 15 acre parcel is simply used for 'yard' rather than for a rural land use (see 'Land Use—Rural'). In this example—the single-family house and the 15 acre parcel are considered to be a 'low-intensity urban' land-use. Conversely—a single-family house on a 200 acre parcel that is farmed *is* a rural land-use if it is accessory to the primary use of the land for agriculture. See definition for 'Urban' and 'Rural'. See also 'Rural Residential'.

Residential land uses provide housing for households (See definition of 'household' in Chapter 2). A variety of residential 'unit types' provide housing for households, including: single-family detached; single-family attached such as townhouses; duplexes, and multi-family housing such as condominiums and apartments. Two types of residential 'tenure' exist: owner-occupied and rental. See Chapter 2 for more information...

Rural/Rural Area: An area *primarily* exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics: 1) economic production and rural development/land-uses which depend on the land itself—most usually agriculture; 2) areas suitable for the location of land-uses that are inappropriate in proximity to urban development (both high and low-intensity), such as land-fills, quarries, wind-energy farms, rifle ranges, kennels, etc...; 3) undeveloped (natural) areas that have not been developed for rural or urban land-uses. Because the term 'rural' by itself can be particularly vague in land-use/regulation discussions and plans, this plan seeks to use the more precise terms 'Development—Rural'; 'Development—Urban, Low Intensity'; 'Undeveloped'; and 'Land Use—Rural' as defined in this 'definitions' section. See these definitions for further information.

Rural Residential. A misnomer for low-intensity urbanization. This Plan will not use the term 'rural residential' but will instead use the term 'Urban Development—Low Intensity'. For farm houses and similar non-urban residential land-uses, see 'Residential Uses Accessory to a Rural Land Use' under 'Residential'. See also 'Ruralification'.

Ruralification. A nonsensical term meant to illustrate the point that the division of land into parcels for low-intensity urban development (typically residential...) is in fact a form of urbanization, not withstanding confusing terminology that typically describes such development as 'rural residential'. (See 'Rural Residential') Put another way, dividing a large farm—or a portion of a farm—into multiple 5 acres parcels for homes does not 'ruralify' the land but rather urbanizes it. See 'Residential'.

Service/Served. The primary infrastructure that provides urban development with a) potable water and b) human waste treatment. Low-intensity urban development is ‘served’ with private well and private septic field infrastructure service. High-intensity urban development is ‘served’ with municipal infrastructure service (municipal water mains and municipal sanitary sewer systems). See Utilities/Urban Services. See also ‘Infrastructure’.

Urbanization. A two-part process whereby lands that are either undeveloped (natural) or developed for *rural* land-uses are developed for urban land-uses such as residential, commercial, or industrial activities. Part 1) The process of *dividing land* into parcels smaller than 35 acres in size to allow non-rural land-uses such as the construction of buildings for residential, commercial, or industrial purposes and Part 2) The process of *creating primary infrastructure* for buildings and the inhabitants of those buildings (including residents, workers, and the public...). See ‘Infrastructure’, ‘Development—Urban’, and ‘Service/Served’. (Note: Secondary infrastructure considerations that accompany urbanization include schools, public safety, public health, parks, storm water management and other matters.) There are two basic ‘levels’ of urbanization—a) low-intensity urbanization and b) high-intensity urbanization. See ‘Development, Urban’ above.

Undeveloped. Lands that have not been altered by humans. Land that has not experienced rural or urban development. (See ‘Development—Rural’ and ‘Development—Urban’) Agricultural lands are *not* considered to be undeveloped by this plan. With the exception of some forest preserves and similar ‘nature preserves’, very few lands in the Verona Area are truly ‘undeveloped’, as most lands—including portions of floodplains and wet-lands—have been developed for either rural land-uses such as crop agriculture or for either low-intensity or high-intensity urban land-uses such as housing. Examples of truly ‘Undeveloped’ areas include those few flood-plains and wetlands that have not been cultivated and those few woodlands that have not been logged. Note—restoring previously developed lands to an undeveloped state—such as a prairie restoration project that converts agriculturally-developed land *back* to an undeveloped state are considered by this plan to be ‘undeveloped’. County Parks, forest preserves and similar lands are therefore considered to be ‘undeveloped’ even if they were previously developed for agriculture or other uses.

Urbanized Area. An area that has urbanized with either high-intensity urbanization or low-intensity urbanization.

Urban Area—High Intensity. An area that has developed with high-intensity urban development, including utilities.

Urban Area—Low Intensity. An area that has developed with low-intensity urban development, including well and septic systems.

Urban Service Area (USA). An area that has been approved by the Department of Natural Resources to be served with utilities to allow high-intensity urban development. To avoid confusion between low-intensity *urban* development—which is allowed outside of urban service areas—and high-intensity *urban* development—which is not allowed outside of urban service areas—this plan recommends that the term ‘utility service area’ be utilized rather than the more confusing ‘urban service area’, since urban development can occur both within and outside of urban service areas.

Utilities/Urban Services. Primary infrastructure that provides ‘service’ to High Intensity Urban Development (See ‘Service/Served’, ‘Infrastructure’, and see also ‘Development—Urban’...). Utilities/Urban Services are of two basic types, both of which are typically publicly-owned and managed: 1) Municipal potable water systems including wells, towers, pumps and mains that provide potable water to high-intensity urban development. 2) Municipal sanitary sewer systems to remove and ultimately treat human waste from high-intensity urban development. Note: In Dane County—utilities are often referred to as ‘urban services’.

Because low-intensity urbanization does not require (what are confusingly-called...) ‘urban services’—even though it is a form of ‘urban development’—this Plan recommends use of the term ‘utility services’ rather than ‘urban services’ specifically to clarify that low-intensity urban development that is not on ‘utility services’ (but is rather served by private well and septic systems...) is nonetheless a form of ‘urban development’.

Verona Area The City of Verona and any lands within three miles of the city’s municipal boundary at the time of the adoption of this comprehensive plan, *except* a) lands located north of CTH ‘PD’ which are included in the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan and b) lands located east of Fitchrona Road. See the ‘Intergovernmental Cooperation’ chapter for more information.

Section Two—Sub-Section 1—Amount, type, intensity, and density of existing land uses (Current City)

Overall, Verona annexed about 1,540 acres from 1970 to 2000. The City also saw development of more than 1,000 acres of land or a 237% increase during that time period. [Table 8-1](#) shows the generalized land use changes during the thirty years prior to 2000. In 2000 about one-third of Verona land area was undeveloped; some of which is undevelopable due to environmental or other constraints, while others are awaiting development. See [Table 8-1](#) and [Table 8-8](#).

Table 8-1: City of Verona Summary of Generalized Land Uses: 1970 to 2000								
Land Use in Acres	Within the Municipality							
	1970	1980	1990	2000			1970-2000	
				Total	Percent of Developed Area	Percent of Total	Total	Percent Change
Residential Total	170.4	287.3	459.1	634.0	43.9%	29.0%	463.6	272%
Business Total	50.2	72.3	140.8	191.6	13.3%	8.8%	141.4	282%
Public Total	208.9	252.5	351.5	619.8	42.9%	28.3%	410.9	197%
Developed Land	429.5	612.1	951.4	1,445.4	100%	66.1%	1,015.9	237%
Undeveloped Total	218.9	367.8	286.2	741.4		33.9%	522.5	239%
City Total	648.4	979.9	1,237.6	2,186.8		100%	1,538.4	237%
Source: Dane County Regional Planning Commission								
Note—Residential includes four types of housing; Business includes manufacturing, wholesaling, commercial retail and services; Public includes street rights-of-way, communication & utilities, institutional & governmental and outdoor recreation, including developed parks.								

Compared to the land use data in 2000 for the City of Madison and Dane County, the City of Verona has a much larger percentage of its acreage in residential use. For business-type uses, Verona has a larger proportion of its developed area in commercial or industrial lands than does Dane County, but less than that for Madison. Both Madison and Dane County have a larger percentage of their developed lands in public-type uses than does Verona. See [Table 8-2](#).

Table 8-2: A Comparison of Developed Land Uses in Madison, Verona and Dane County						
Land Use in Acres	City of Verona		City of Madison		Dane County	
	Total	Percent of Developed Area	Total	Percent of Developed Area	Total	Percent of Developed Area
Residential Total	634	44%	12,169	37%	49,194	39%
Business Total	192	13%	5,068	15%	14,025	11%
Public Total	620	43%	15,751	48%	63,836	50%
Developed Land	1,445	100%	32,988	100%	127,055	100%
Source: Dane County Regional Planning Commission						
Note—Residential includes four types of housing; Business includes manufacturing, wholesaling, commercial retail and services; Public includes street rights-of-way, communication & utilities, institutional & governmental and outdoor recreation, including developed parks.						

[Map 8-1](#) shows current land-uses within the City of Verona, as of 2005. [Map 8-2](#) shows current zoning within the City of Verona as of March of 2009.

Section Two—Sub-Section 2—Density of Residential Land Uses (Current City)

As shown in [Tables 8-1 and 8-2](#) above, residential development makes up the largest portion of development in Verona. Therefore, the factors that affect net residential density (the number of housing units per acre...) will probably have the largest impact on the amount of land needed for development in the City of Verona.

See Chapter 2 for this Plan's detailed analysis and recommendations regarding residential density.

[Table 8-3](#) shows three components of net density: 1) the average household size of the population requiring housing; 2) the proportion of housing types and 3) the amount of land required per lot by zoning or by developer or consumer choice.

Household Size The first factor that affects housing or population density is household size. During the time period from 1970 to 2000, the average household size in Verona has dropped from 3.27 persons per household in 1970 to 2.65 persons per household. During the past 30 years, the average household size has declined nationwide, due to a reduction in the number of children per family and an increase in the rate of divorce. To illustrate the effect of household size on residential density, consider the following example. If the average Verona household size in 1970 had remained unchanged by 2000, the City would need only 2,157 housing units (Or 507 fewer housing units than the 2,664 units that existed in 2000) to house its 2000 population of 7,052. A reduction in average household size has meant more land has been needed for housing fewer people.

Housing Unit Type The second factor that affects density is housing unit type. From 1970 to 2000 the percentage of all housing units made up by single family units fell from about 72% of the total in 1970 to about 69% of the total by 2000, while the percentage of two family and multifamily units increased from 29% to 31%. The change in the relative percentage of different housing types can most likely be attributed to a greater number of small-sized households (divorced parents or households without children, for example...) needing less space or fewer bedrooms than typically provided in single family type housing units.

Land Requirements The third factor that affects density is the average lot size per unit by type. In Verona, the average single family density stayed constant at 3.3 units per acre from 1970 to 2000 and the average density of two and multifamily housing actually decreased by 14%, causing overall residential density to stay at about 4.2 housing units per acre. Note that [Table 8-3](#) categorizes two-family units with multifamily units, rather than single-family units, although one and two-family units are also shown. This is done only in this one instance, because the average household size of two-family households are similar to multifamily households and much smaller than single family households, although the building style of two-family units are more like single family units than multifamily units. Also over the next twenty years or so more seniors are anticipated to live in duplex units than families with children. (See chapter 2 for definitions of 'household', 'family' and similar housing-related terms.)

Table 8-3: City of Verona Residential Land Use: 1970 to 2000

Data Item	Within the Municipality				1970-2000 Change	
	1970	1980	1990	2000	Number	Percent
Population	2,334	3,336	5,374	7,052	4,718	202%
<i>Persons Per Housing Unit</i>	3.27	2.75	2.75	2.65	(0.62)	-19%
Total Number of Housing Units	715	1,212	1,954	2,664	1,949	273%
1-Family Housing (units)	512	805	1,393	1,835	1,323	258%
1 & 2 Family Housing (units)	621	925	1,534	2,149		
2+ Family Housing (units)	205	407	557	829	624	304%
Total Residential Area (acres)	170.4	287.3	459.1	634.0	463.6	272%
1-Family Residential (acres)	153.0	254.4	409.1	552.6	399.6	261%
1 & 2 Family Residential (acres)	165.5	270.8	426.6	587.2	421.7	2558%
2+ Family Residential (acres)	17.4	32.9	50.0	81.4	64.0	368%
Residential Net Density	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2	0.0	0%
1-Family Net Residential Density	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.3	0.0	0%
1 & 2 Family Net Residential Density	3.8	3.4	3.6	3.7	-0.1	-3%
2+ Family Net Residential Density	11.8	12.4	11.1	10.2	(1.6)	-14%
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and Dane County Regional Planning Commission						

Section Two—Sub-Section 3—Detailed Amount, Type and Intensity of Land Uses (Current City)

Residential Development: Residential development accounts for the majority (44%) of the developed acreage in the City. Single family residential development accounts for 25% of the developed area and 87% of all residential development. During the 1980's and 1990's, the amount of land used for residential purposes was about 173 acres for each of the two decades. The development of land for multifamily housing increased the most during the 1990's, while the number of two-family units increased the least. Based upon residential building permits, it is expected that the amount of the multifamily residential acreage has increased even faster after the year 2000 (See Chapter 2). [See Table 8-4.](#)

See Chapter 2 for a more detailed analysis of existing residential development in the City of Verona, as well as for a thorough discussion of recommendations for residential policies, goals, objectives, and programs.

Table 8-4: City of Verona Detailed Land Uses: 1970 to 2000								
Land Use in Acres	Within the Municipality							
	1970	1980	1990	2000			1970-2000	
				2000 Total	Percent of Developed Area	Percent of Total	Total	Percent Change
Single Family Residential	153.0	254.4	409.1	552.6	38.2%	25.3%	399.6	261%
Two Family Residential	10.1	16.4	21.3	34.6	2.4%	1.6%	24.5	243%
One & Two Family Residential	163.1	270.8	430.4	587.2	40.6%	26.9%	424.1	260%
Multifamily Residential	7.3	16.5	28.7	46.8	3.2%	2.1%	39.5	541%
Commercial Retail & Services	29.5	46.5	98.2	116.9	8.1%	5.3%	87.4	296%
Industrial	20.7	25.8	42.6	74.7	5.2%	3.4%	54.0	261%
Street Right-of-Way	88.7	126.0	191.4	371.3	25.7%	17.0%	282.6	319%
Transport, Com. & Utilities	12.1	27.2	14.3	22.9	1.6%	1.0%	10.8	89%
Institutional & Governmental	90.2	72.7	74.3	147.2	10.2%	6.7%	57.0	63%
Outdoor Recreation	17.9	26.6	71.5	78.4	5.4%	3.6%	60.5	338%
Developed Land	429.5	612.1	951.4	1,445.4	100%	66.1%	1,015.9	237%
Vacant, Unused Land		141.5	131.1	280.0		12.8%		
Woodlands		-	-	34.3		1.6%		
Other Open Lands		28.2	28.2	88.3		4.0%		
Water		10.5	18.4	24.3		1.1%		
Cropland or Pasture		187.6	108.5	314.5		14.4%		
Undeveloped Total	218.9	367.8	286.2	741.4		33.9%	522.5	239%
City Total	648.4	979.9	1,237.6	2,186.8		100%	1,538.4	237%
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and Dane County Regional Planning Commission								

Non-Residential Development: From 1970 to 2000, the industrial park on the City's southwest side and the commercial park on the City's east side have accounted for the greatest share in the expansion of non-residential (industrial and commercial) land use in Verona. Although commercial development expanded faster than industrial development, the combined acreages for the two uses increased by nearly four-fold, from over 50 acres in 1970 to nearly 192 acres in 2000. [See Table 8-4.](#)

See Chapter 6 for a more detailed analysis of existing commercial and industrial development in the City of Verona, as well as for a thorough discussion of recommendations for commercial and industrial development goals, objectives, policies, and programs.

Street Rights-of Way: Public streets to serve residential, commercial, and industrial development accounted for about 26% of the total developed area within the City of Verona. Some of the major highway

construction located within the city limits contributed to the percentage of developed land area increasing from 20% of the total in 1970 to 26% in 2000.

Institutional and Governmental Use: Areas for schools, school grounds, churches and public buildings made up about 150 acres—or more than ten percent of the total developed area within the City of Verona in 2000.

Outdoor Recreation: About 78 acres of land for developed park use (not including natural areas or lake areas) accounted for more than five percent of Verona's developed area.

Section Two—Sub-Section 4—Land Use Changes Since 2000 (Current City)

The previous section analyzed Census data from 1970 to 2000. The following section will more closely examine land use data which became available for 2005, although housing and population after 2000 can only be estimated.

Table 8-5 shows the generalized land use changes from 1970 to 2005 and Table 8-6 shows detailed land use changes for the same time period. Verona annexed about 1,540 acres from 1970 to 2000 and about 853 acres from 2000 to 2005. (See Table 8-7 for a more detailed summary of annexations between 1995 and 2008) The City also saw development of nearly 584 acres since 2000, or a ratio of about two-thirds of the vacant land added from annexations in this 5-year time period. Over the past 35 years, the City of Verona and many other developing suburban municipalities typically had about one-third of their land area as either ‘not yet developed’ or preserved in natural areas. The last 25 years of that time period (1980-2005) may serve as a beginning point to determine the amount of land area and development that the City may require in the next 25 years. About 1,417 acres of land was developed during the last 25 years. In 2005 about one-third of Verona land area was undeveloped, some due to environmental constraints and others that are ‘awaiting development’. See Table 8-8 for more information.

Table 8-5: City of Verona Generalized Land Use: 1970 to 2005								
Acres of Land Use	Dane County Regional Plan Commission Land Use Inventory for Verona					Percent of 2005 Total	Change 1980-2005	
	1970*	1980	1990	2000	2005		Number	Percent
Residential	170.4	287.3	459.1	634.0	850.1	41.9%	562.8	196%
Business	50.2	72.3	140.7	191.6	320.6	15.8%	248.3	343%
Transportation	N/A	146.0	197.7	388.0	544.8	26.8%	NA	
Public Land Use, except Trans.	120.2	106.5	153.8	232.0	313.8	15.5%	207.3	195%
TOTAL DEVELOPED AREA	429.5	612.1	951.3	1,445.6	2,029.3	100%	1,417.2	232%
Percent Developed	66%	62%	77%	66%	67%			
AGRICULTURE & UNDEVELOPED	218.9	367.8	286.2	741.4	1011.0		643.2	175%
TOTAL AREA	648.4	979.9	1,237.5	2,187.0	3,040.3		2,060.4	210%
*Note that 1970 data in the table above is not used in last 25 year comparison. Source: Dane County Regional Planning Commission and Dane County Community Analysis & Planning Division								

Residential Development: By 2005 residential development accounted for the majority (42%) of the developed acreage in the City. Single family residential development accounted for 35% of the developed area and 84% of all residential development. From 2000 to 2005, the amount of residentially-developed land increased by about 216 acres. During the last 25 years, single family residential acres within the City of Verona increased by 180%, while multifamily residential acres increased by 491 percent! See Table 8-6.

Table 8-6: City of Verona Detailed Land Use: 1970 to 2005

Acres of Land Use	Dane County Regional Plan Commission Land Use Inventory For Verona					Percent of 2005 Total	Change 1980-2005	
	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005		Number	Percent
Single Family	153.0	254.4	409.1	552.6	711.5	35.1%	457.1	180%
Two Family	10.1	16.4	21.3	34.6	43.5	2.1%	27.1	165%
Multifamily & Other	7.3	15.0	28.7	45.3	88.7	4.4%	73.7	491%
Group Quarters	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	6.4	0.3%	4.9	326%
RESIDENTIAL	170.4	287.3	459.1	634.0	850.1	41.9%	562.8	196%
Manufacturing	19.8	21.7	35.4	59.8	85.4	4.2%	63.7	293%
Wholesale	0.9	4.1	7.1	14.9	13.8	0.7%	9.7	236%
Extractive	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.2%	4.8	
INDUSTRIAL	20.7	25.8	42.5	74.7	103.9	5.1%	78.1	303%
General Repair & Maintenance	N/A	6.3	5.4	1.2	1.7	0.1%	-4.6	-73%
Transportation Related	N/A	7.2	9.6	17.1	23.0	1.1%	15.8	219%
Other	N/A	15.3	57.8	21.3	30.5	1.5%	15.2	99%
COMMERCIAL RETAIL	15.3	28.8	72.8	39.7	55.2	2.7%	26.4	92%
Lodging	2.0	3.0	3.2	3.4	4.1	0.2%	1.1	38%
Other	12.2	14.7	22.2	73.8	157.4	7.8%	142.7	971%
COMMERCIAL SERVICES	14.2	17.7	25.4	77.2	161.5	8.0%	143.8	813%
Right of Way	88.7	126.0	191.4	371.3	528.1	26.0%	402.1	319%
Other, including rails to trails	N/A	20.0	6.3	16.7	16.8	0.8%	-3.2	-16%
TRANSPORTATION	N/A	146.0	197.7	388.0	544.8	26.8%	398.8	273%
Generating Processing	N/A	0.5	0.9	2.4	1.3	0.1%	0.8	164%
Transmission	N/A	0.2	0.2	1.8	2.2	0.1%	2.0	997%
Other	N/A	6.5	6.9	2.0	3.4	0.2%	-3.1	-48%
COMMUNICATION/UTILITIES	12.1	7.2	8.0	6.2	6.9	0.3%	-0.3	-4%
Education	N/A	59.6	59.6	106.7	121.4	6.0%	61.8	104%
Administrative	N/A	0.2	4.3	4.8	5.5	0.3%	5.3	2663%
Cemetery & Other	N/A	12.9	10.4	35.8	69.4	3.4%	56.5	438%
INSTITUTIONAL/GOVERNMENTAL	90.2	72.7	74.3	147.3	196.3	9.7%	123.6	170%
OUTDOOR RECREATION	17.9	26.6	71.5	78.5	110.6	5.5%	84.0	316%
TOTAL DEVELOPED AREA	429.5	612.1	951.3	1,445.6	2,029.3	100.0%	1,417.2	232%
Vacant Unused Lands	N/A	141.5	131.1	280.0	370.3		228.8	162%
Cropland Pasture	N/A	187.6	108.5	314.5	278.3		90.7	48%
Woodlands & Other Open Lands	N/A	28.2	28.2	122.6	307.0		278.8	989%
Water	7.9	10.5	18.4	24.3	55.3		44.8	427%
AGRICULTURE & UNDEVELOPED	218.9	367.8	286.2	741.4	1,011.0		643.2	175%
TOTAL AREA	648.4	979.9	1,237.5	2,187.0	3,040.3		2,060.4	210%

Source: Dane County Regional Planning Commission and Dane County Community Analysis & Planning Division

Industrial Development: From 2000 to 2005, industrial development increased more than during any other 5-year period since 1970. Industrial development continues to make up about five percent of the City's developed area. Although commercial development expanded faster than industrial development, the combined acreages for the two uses increased by nearly four-fold, from over 50 acres in 1970 to nearly 192 acres in 2000. The addition of the Technology Park subdivision on the city's southeast side—at the intersection of CTH's 'M' and 'PB' account for most of this new/additional industrially-developed land.

Commercial Development: Commercial development—both retail and services—have expanded since 1970, and especially after 2000. Commercial development makes up nearly 11% of Verona’s developed area and about two-thirds of the City’s business development area

Street Rights-of Way: Public streets to serve residential and business development accounted for about 27% of the total developed area within the City of Verona. Some of major highway construction located within the city limits contributed to the percentage of developed land area classified as ‘Right-of-Way’ increasing by 347 acres since 1990.

Communications & Utilities: Communications and utilities was the only land use category that decreased since 1990, primarily due to the closure of the City’s wastewater treatment plant in the early 1990s.

Institutional and Governmental Use: Areas for schools, school grounds, churches and public buildings made up more than 196 acres—or about ten percent of the total developed area within the City of Verona in 2005. Lands for schools make up over 60% of the ‘institutional and governmental’ category.

Outdoor Recreation: About 111 acres of land for developed park use (not including natural areas or lake areas) accounted for more than five percent of Verona’s developed area.

Section Two—Sub-Section 5—City of Verona Annexations 1995-2008 (Current City)

Looking at [Table 8-7](#), most of the lands that were annexed into the City of Verona during the period between 1995-2008 can be classified into four distinct ‘groups’, as follows:

- Annexations with lands that are already developed with houses or businesses at the time of annexation and with no additional development after annexation, as seen in September of 1996 and 1997 as well as in February of 2001. Most of these annexations were small in size;
- Annexations with lands used for right-of-way, governmental, or other ‘clean-up’ purposes, as seen in annexations in September of 1997 and September of 1998 (right-of-way); in June of 1999 (right-of-way and water tower site); December of 2000 (utilities); January of 2005 (Library site); and June of 2006 (right-of-way). These annexations were relatively small in size. More recent right-of-way annexations—including the annexation of right-of-way for USH 18-151 at the Epic Lane ramps (June, 2008) and the annexation of right-of-way for USH 18-151 at the ‘PB’ ramps (May, 2008) included large areas of USH 18-151 right-of-way and comparatively small areas of private land for development;
- Annexations of farm land (rural development—see ‘definitions’ section...) that rapidly urbanized with high-intensity urban development within 3-5 years after annexation. These areas often became commercial or residential subdivisions after annexation. Examples include the Burgenske/Gutherie and Acker annexations in 1997, which became—respectively—the Gateway Estates and Bruce Street Industrial park subdivisions; the Heath/Burgenske annexation in 1998—which became Prairie Oaks mixed-use subdivision; the Gust annexation in December of 1998—which became the Prairie Crest mixed-use subdivision; the Hoffman and Adams annexations in May of 2000—which became—respectively—the Bruce Street and Technology Park industrial subdivisions; and the Tollefson annexation in May of 2003—which became the Hawthorne Hills subdivision, including an elementary school and Vincenzo Plaza commercial area. These annexations tended to be the largest annexations, although some—such as the Hoffman annexation in May of 2000—were not large;
- Annexations of farm land (rural development—see ‘definitions’ section...) that slowly urbanized with high-intensity development over a longer period of time (more than 5 years...) OR that remains only developed for agriculture/rural use at the time this plan is written. These parcels are outlined below in [Table 8-8](#), followed by an analysis. Note that the city seeks to minimize the amount of land that it annexes that does not get developed with urban development within a short (3-5 years) period of time.

NOTE: Market conditions can play a significant role in the time it takes for annexed lands to develop with urban land-uses. As this plan is written (2009), a significant down-turn in the national and global economy has slowed-down development timing, and lands that were annexed within the last few years—such as the ‘Acker’ and ‘Witt’ farms south of USH 18-151—may require more time to urbanize than originally anticipated. Again—the city seeks to minimize the amount of land that it annexes that does not get developed with urban development within a short (3-5 years) period of time.

Table 8-7: City of Verona Annexations—1995-2008

Annexation	Date	Acres	Purpose	Result
1995				
No annexations in 1995		0		
1996				
Weiland-Nine Mound	September	4.2	Residential	2 existing houses on North Nine Mound.
1997				
Burgenske/Gutherie	April	124.25	Residential Commercial	Gateway Estates Badger Prairie Neighborhood
Acker	June	26.63	Industrial	Bruce Street Industrial Park
Kubly	August	8.3	Residential	Developed as part of Hawthorne Hills
Behnke	September	1	Residential	Existing house at 485 Cross Country Road
Locust Drive/Matts	September	2.3	Right-of-way	Locust Drive Road right-of-way
Heath/Burgenske	November	60.12	Mixed-Use	Prairie Oaks
1998				
Paoli/Venture Court	September	.29	Right-of-way	Venture Court Industrial Park
VanDeGrift	October	178.65	Office/Industrial	Yet to be Developed (See Table 8-8)
Bell	December	1.61	Residential	Existing House at 550 N. Nine Mound
Gust	December	49.97	Residential and Office	Prairie Crest
1999				
'Water Tower'	June	1.3	Institutional	Water Tower site
'Military Ridge Park'	June	26.5	Parkland	Park area north of Military Ridge subdivision
'PB' right-of-way	June	2.3	Right-of-way	Right-of-way on 'Old PB'
Zingg	August	85.15	Residential/School	Kettle Creek and Elementary School
2000				
Matts	March	4	Residential	1 Existing house at 463 South Main.
Fischer	March	5.14	Commercial	Kwik Trip
Fischer	March	12.93	Office/Industrial	Not Developed (See Table 8-8)
Hoffman	May	12.37	Industrial	Bruce Street Industrial Park
Adams	May	144	Industrial	Verona Technology Park
Zingg	May	7.2	Parkland and Residential	Park and 6 houses in Kettle Creek
'Booster Station'	October	9.7	Institutional	Booster Station
Livesey	December	.22	Clean-up	Utilities
2001				
Kavon	February	.28	Commercial	Existing business at 209 Paoli
Epic	November	345	Office	Epic corporate campus
2002				
Coating Place	July	3.00	Industrial	Expansion
Ineichen/Harmony Drive	August	46.60	Residential	Harmony Hills
2003				
Meister and 2 houses on 9-Mound	March	116.90	Residential	Residential
Tollefson (With Rockweiler Tsunehiro, and Matts...)	May	186.00	Residential, Institutional, Commercial	Hawthorne Hills New School Vincenzo Plaza
2004				
Hometown Village	July	0	Commercial, Residential	Voided by town lawsuit
Pollow	September	104.70	Residential, Commercial	Cross Point Subdivision Not developed (See Table 8-8)
2005				
Library Site—Badger Prairie	January	4.30	Institutional	Library
Thompson/Erbach Site	May	139.35	Commercial	Not developed (See Table 8-8)
Epic 10 acre Parcel	August	10.00	Commercial	Epic Campus
Military Ridge State Trail	August	11.64	Institutional	Bike Trail
Acker Farm	September	91.99	Residential	Scenic Ridge
Witt Farm	September	149.01	Residential	Cathedral Point
2006				
West Verona Avenue	June	13.3	Right-of-Way	Right-of-way
Hometown Village	June	34.00	Commercial	Hometown Circle
Davis Farm	November	111.6	Industrial	Not developed (See Table 8-8)
2007				
No annexations in 2007		0		
2008				
W. Verona Avenue—West End	January	2	ROW (for development)	Right-of-way
E. Verona Avenue/Badger Prairie Park	January	129	ROW and parkland	Right-of-way. No change to parkland.
Peterson/Alliant parcel for Krantz	May	100.5	86.5 acres of ROW & existing development & 14 acres developable land	Primarily right-of-way. Some Industrial and commercial development expected.
6-Acre 'County Parcel' E. Verona Avenue	May	6.7	Commercial & cemetery	Commercial expected (not commenced...)
Graves Site—613 W. Verona Avenue	June	73.3	72 acres of ROW & 1 acre commercial	Commercial expected (not commenced...)
Total:		2,447.3		
Average acres annexed per year, 1995-2008:		188.25		

It has been the City of Verona's policy for many years to only annex lands where urban development is 'imminent'. The City has no desire to annex more land into the city than can realistically be urbanized within the near future (3-5 years). In other words—the city avoids 'land-banking' to the extent possible. It is worth examining, therefore, those properties that *have* been annexed into the City but that have *not* been urbanized reasonably quickly. Please see [Table 8-8](#) for a summary of these properties and an analysis of their development potential. These properties are described in greater detail in Part Five—Future Plans for the Current City—below.

As [Table 8-8](#) shows, all lands that have been annexed into the City since 1995 have seen some degree of development commence since annexation *except* four properties:

- VanDeGrift/Fischer (now 'Reinke'): Review of development proposals for this 191 acre area located in the northeast quadrant of County Trunk Highway's 'PB' and 'M', on the city's southeast side are underway at the time this Plan is being prepared. The City has designated this area for industrial development such as an office or industrial park. The City expects development in this area to begin within 5 years;
- Matt's and Tsunehiro: These lands were annexed as part of the Tollefson annexation in 2003. The 38 acre Matt's property is almost exclusively in floodplain and so development potential is limited. The 21 acre Tsunehiro property is occupied almost entirely by a lake/former quarry;
- Erbach: These 80 acre were annexed due to development pressure on the Thompson Farm (now 'West End') immediately to the west. Development of the Erbach parcel is not expected in the short term;
- Davis: The 111 acre Davis parcel was annexed to accommodate the expansion of the 'Technology Park' industrial subdivision. Development is uncertain due to county-wide USA policy changes in 2008 that call into question whether or not some or all of this property will be added to the city's urban service area.

See Section Five—Future Plans for the Current City—below for more information about plans for these properties.

Table 8-8: Lands Annexed to the City Without Urban Development as of 2009					
Property	Year Annexed	Acres	Development Approvals in Place	Anticipated Uses	Development Timing
VanDeGrift & Fischer ¹	1998	178 & 13	In USA, Not platted Not zoned	Non-residential Non-retail	Development has <i>not</i> commenced ¹ .
Bice/Matt's and Tsunehiro	2003	59	In USA, Not platted Not zoned	Not known	Development is <i>not expected</i> .
Pollow	2004	104	In USA, Platted Zoned	Residential	Development <u>has</u> commenced.
Acker Farm	2005	92	In USA, Platted Zoned	Residential	Development <u>has</u> commenced.
Witt Farm	2005	149	In USA, Platted Zoned	Residential	Development <u>has</u> commenced.
Thompson Farm	2006	62	In USA, Zoned, Not platted	Mixed-use, primarily commercial	Development <u>has</u> commenced.
Erbach Farm	2006	80	In USA, Not platted Not zoned	Mixed-use, primarily commercial	Development has <i>not</i> commenced.
Davis Farm ²	2006	111	Not in USA ² . Not platted. Not zoned.	Industrial	Development has <i>not</i> commenced.
Note 1—The VanDeGrift/Fischer property was annexed into the city in order to create an industrial Tax Increment District in a location where non-residential development was anticipated in the long-term due to its proximity to a major highway interchange.					
Note 2—CARPC rules regarding USA expansions were changed <i>after</i> the Davis Farm was annexed, causing the city to withdraw its request to include the Davis Farm in the City's USA.					

Section Two—Sub-Section 6—Analysis of trends in the supply, demand and price of land (Current City)

Pattern of City Growth

According to the Dane County Regional Trends 2006, the total land area in the City of Verona in September 2000 was 1,971 acres. In January of 2005 the total had increased to 3,590 acres, a difference of 1,619 acres. Compared to all Dane County cities and villages, Verona ranked fourth in total acreage annexed during that time period, behind the City of Madison (4,908 acres), the Village of DeForest (1,719 acres), and the City of Sun Prairie (1,658). The current 2009 land area within the Verona city limits is approximately 4,570 acres.

During the last ten years, Verona's growth has occurred on the north, southeast and west sides of the city. The individual subdivisions developed or developing during that time period are identified in [Table 8-7](#).

Neighborhood Development Types

Prior to World War II, Verona developed on a grid pattern characterized by rectangular city blocks with 36-foot wide streets, small lots, and sidewalks. Following World War II, Verona developed with more typical 'suburban' style subdivisions characterized by curvilinear streets (still 36-feet wide...), many cul-de-sacs, larger lots, and few sidewalks. Starting in the 1990s, the City revised its policies and began requiring sidewalks in new subdivisions, as well as allowing smaller sized single-family parcels (See the 'Community Residential' zoning section in Chapter 2—Housing...).

Although Traditional Neighborhood Developments (TNDs) and mixed use developments are present in other Dane County cities and villages—like Middleton, Madison and Sun Prairie—these types of developments have had little influence in Verona, except for redevelopment in Verona's downtown. TND characteristics include a mix of housing, interconnected streets, pedestrian orientation, and mid to small lot sizes. TND also includes use of alleys with rear access and architectural design controls. Throughout most of its history, Verona has segregated single-family neighborhoods, multifamily areas, and commercial districts into separate areas, although 'mixed-uses' existed in the earliest days of the community in the form of residential units over commercial businesses in the downtown and more recent projects have continued this tradition. (See [Table 8-9](#)—Planned Unit Developments—for a summary of mixed-use projects from the last 2 decades...)

As land costs rise and as the composition of household types changes from families with children toward other household types (such as baby-boomer 'empty-nesters' whose children have left home...See Chapter 1 for more information...), market pressure has been created for additional higher density, multi-family types of housing including town houses, condominiums, and apartments. Advocacy from a variety of sources has also created more of an emphasis on travel for pedestrians and bicyclists by developing sidewalks and trails consistent with Traditional Neighborhood Design developments.

Land Supply and Demand

Availability of land within and around Verona is abundant, unlike some central Dane County communities (such as Monona), although future city growth is limited to the north and northeast as part of a boundary agreement with the City of Madison (See Chapter 7—Intergovernmental Cooperation—for more information...). As of March of 2009, about 400 acres were available to be added to the Verona ‘urban service area’, above and beyond existing lands already included in the Verona USA. See [Map 4-1](#) for the location of the current Verona USA and [Map 4-3](#) for current planning for future growth of the city’s urban service area. The City of Verona has expressed concerns about the probable unintended consequences of these restrictive USA policies—particularly that they will create *disincentives* for dense urban development within USAs (typically incorporated areas...) and therefore create pressure—and therefore incentives—for new development in areas outside of USAs (typically unincorporated areas...). See Chapter 4—Utilities and Community Facilities—for more information.

Land Value and Housing Costs

The median average residential value of owner-occupied housing in Verona was \$161,500 in 1999, according to the U. S. Census Bureau. Since 2000, only estimated values are available from other sources, such as ESRI Business Information Solutions. Each year in February the Wisconsin State Journal publishes the “Book of Business” which includes estimates of housing costs by zip code. According to ESRI, the median owner-occupied housing unit value in the Verona zip code (53593) increased from \$217,768 in 2005 to \$238,799 in 2006 and \$266,470 in 2007. The data showing the impact of the national housing recession which began in 2008 and continues in ‘full-swing’ as this plan is being finalized (2009) is not yet available.

Despite the decline in the number of new single family homes authorized by building permit since 2005 (See [Tables 2-19 and 2-21](#)), home values continued to rise through 2007. The increase in the rise of home values between 2005 and 2007 was not as fast as the values increased between 2000 and 2005. As this plan is being finalized—data are not available on local home values since the national housing recession began in 2008.

New Development and Redevelopment Opportunities

New development opportunities are primarily located on the periphery of the existing municipal limits of the City of Verona. These opportunities for future growth of the City of Verona are shown on [Map 4-3](#) and on [Map 8-4](#). As in the past, the City believes that new urban development should be allowed only through gradual outward expansion of the existing urban area at the ‘developing edge’ of the city, rather than through ‘leap-frog’ development that ‘jumps’ over undeveloped land to allow development and urbanization beyond undeveloped areas. It should be stated, however, that this policy is not ‘hard and fast’, and when the City determines that the development of a particular area makes sense—even if undeveloped areas must be by-passed—than the city will pursue such development. For example—to develop the former ‘Thompson Farm’ on West Verona Avenue (now the ‘West End’ project...), the ‘Erbach Farm’ had to be by-passed. The owners of the Erbach farm indicated that they did not wish to have their land developed. Because the Thompson Farm was adjacent to a full-access interchange between Verona Avenue and USH 18-151, the City determined that by-passing the Erbach Farm to allow development of the ‘further away’ Thompson Farm was justified.

In addition to new development on the growing edge of the city’s perimeter, *redevelopment* opportunities also exist in two primary locations *within* the City of Verona: in the downtown area and along Verona Avenue. During the past decade, market pressures alone have caused a considerable amount of redevelopment to occur, as the examples of Park Bank, Walgreens, Holiday Inn Express, and Klinke Cleaners all illustrate. See Section 5, Subsection 2—Downtown Plan—below, for more information about plans for redevelopment in these areas.

Existing and Potential Land Use Conflicts

There are potential land use conflicts in and around the city. Two primary sources of land-use conflict are identified and addressed by this plan: 1) land use conflicts within the planning area and outside of the current city limits between low-intensity urbanization and adjacent rural land-uses, most typically between residential and near-by agricultural land-uses; and 2) land use conflicts within the planning area and within the current city limits between various types of high-intensity urban land-uses, most typically between residential and near-by commercial land-uses.

There are also some land use conflicts between land-uses and adjacent transportation corridors, such as Main Street (CTH M) or Verona Ave. (CTH MV). Heavy vehicle traffic along these highway corridors and others in the city makes residential land-uses along these streets experience high levels of noise, dust, vibration, and exhaust. These heavily-trafficked streets also can make it difficult for pedestrians to cross from one side to the other. This is especially a problem for customers walking to a business or school students riding or walking back and forth to school.

Lastly, new redevelopment projects in older areas of the city generally create conflicts between the new land uses and the older, existing land-uses once the new uses are introduced to an area. This conflict can be especially acute in areas where projects are proposed next to or near established residential neighborhoods. Also, temporary conflicts between land uses may arise in areas that are in transition, both in the center of the city and along its edges.

Limitations for Future Dense, Efficient Urban Development

Several factors may limit future City of Verona dense, efficient urban development. As stated in Chapter 5—Natural and Cultural Resources—the City believes that dense urban development is the best method to preserve natural resources and protect the environment, especially when compared with the alternative of low-density, inefficient development. Examples of limiting factors include: natural features such as rivers, wetlands, and the terminal moraine; existing low-intensity urban development in unincorporated areas around the city’s perimeter; agreements with adjacent communities such as the intergovernmental agreement between the city’s of Madison and Verona; restrictive USA policies regarding the extension of urban services to accommodate dense, efficient urban growth; and the availability—or lack of availability—of utilities. Some of these constraints also limit the ability of providing additional roadways in the Verona Area to alleviate regional travel on existing streets such as CTH ‘M’ north of the city—and these constraints/barriers are highlighted on [Map 3-6—Transportation Barriers in the Verona Area...](#))

Natural features are one of the main factors limiting where and how future urban development may occur. Principal natural features which limit the location of urban development are: parks, natural preservation areas, rivers, creeks, floodplains, wetlands, steep slopes and woodlands. Locations next to these natural features require designs which take the characteristics of these features into account. These features and other open space areas are usually designated as part of “environmental corridors”. The effect of environmental corridors on the location of development is further discussed in the Utilities and Community Facilities and in the Natural Resources chapters.

Because these natural areas cannot be developed to accommodate population growth, areas that can be developed must be used efficiently. The City of Verona believes that urban development should be encouraged to be as dense/intense as possible along parks and other conservancy areas to a) maximize the number of residents, workers and others within development adjacent to conservancy areas that can take advantage of the conservancy area and b) to compensate for the net decrease in development density that conservation areas cause by preventing lands from being developed.

Availability of public utilities such as public sewer and water and services such as police and fire protection, parks, and school district capacity can limit future urban development. In some cases it is not cost effective to serve some areas with public utilities due to topography.

Planned Unit Developments

See [Map 8-3](#) for the location of all Planned Unit Developments within the City of Verona.

As [Table 8-9](#) indicates, the City of Verona has utilized ‘Planned Unit Developments’—or flexible zoning—to create 23 ‘non-standard’ developments in the community. These developments can be broadly divided between two distinct types of projects—single parcel or small developments (shown in white in [Table 8-9](#)...) and larger ‘neighborhood’ projects (shown in yellow in [Table 8-9](#)...). The former type—single parcel or small planned unit developments—have been especially successful for developing parcels with unique challenges that would have prevented development without the flexibility allowed with PUD zoning. Good examples of these small developments include several PUD project built on parcels along the Military Ridge Bicycle Trail—formerly a railroad line—which are narrow and oddly-shaped. The ‘South Franklin Street Townhouses’ (No. 8); the ‘Railroad Street/Depot Drive’ project (No. 16); and the City Centre’ project (No. 21) are all examples.

Planned Unit Developments have also been utilized to create entire residential or ‘mixed-use’ neighborhoods with commercial and residential uses. Examples of residential PUD neighborhoods include: Badger Prairie (No. 11); Golden Rod Circle (No. 12); and Kettle Woods (No. 15) Neighborhoods, while examples of ‘mixed-use’ PUD neighborhoods include: Prairie Oaks (No. 10 and No. 18); and Prairie Crest (No. 13). These subdivisions were proposed and approved as PUDs either because of their ‘mixed-use’ components—which present challenges that do not exist when residential and commercial uses are strictly segregated as with traditional zoning—or they were proposed with ‘unique’ design features. Examples of ‘unique’ design features in these ‘planned neighborhoods’ include: small-lot single-family parcels such as in Badger Prairie and Golden Rod Circle Neighborhoods (to promote affordability); more narrow public streets as found in Kettle Woods Neighborhood (to minimize development impacts on existing mature trees); and private streets as found in Prairie Oaks and the West End Neighborhoods (to allow more narrow, pedestrian-friendly streets).

Starting in 2005, the City also began requiring any proposals that include ‘large retail businesses’ or ‘big boxes’ to be proposed, reviewed, and approved as ‘Planned Unit Developments’. This requirement was not due to the flexibility that is allowed under PUD zoning, but was rather due to the more rigorous review and approval process that Planned Unit Developments require. To date—two ‘big box’ developments have been proposed and approved as Planned Unit Developments within the City—the ‘West End’ (which exhibits many of the features that would traditionally be appropriate in a planned unit development ‘neighborhood’, such as private streets, mixed uses, set-back relaxations, etc...)—and Hometown Circle (which could have been approved using standard city platting and zoning regulations, since it exhibits none of the features that typically trigger the requirement for a Planned Unit Development).

The City of Verona plans to continue to utilize Planned Unit Development zoning to allow flexibility for creative developments that would not otherwise be allowed by the zoning code and to enable the productive use of otherwise un-useable parcels.

Table 8-9: City of Verona Planned Unit Developments—1980-2008
(See Map 8-3)

Map 8-3 Reference Number	Common Name	Year	Name of Developer	Associated Addresses	Underlying Zoning	Description	Exemptions
Prior to 1984 'FR' Zoning (Precursor to PUD)							
1	Hampton Court Condominiums	1984	Jack Douthitt; Jim Curan, Cedarland	472-500 Basswood and 711-909 Hemlock	Urban Residential	10 buildings with 4, 6 and 8 units each, for a total of 62 dwelling units.	Multiple buildings per parcel. Private roads? NOT density.
June, 1991 'PURD' ordinance adopted (Precursor to PUD)							
2	Sugar Creek Apartments	1991	Chuck Heath, Horizon Development and Heartland Properties, Inc.	206 South Marrietta Street	Urban Residential	Senior, tax credit multi- family residential. 61 units	Density?
3	Grace Street 'PURD'. (AKA "Keystone Replat" Lots 265-270 of Fourth Addition to Cross Country Heights.)	1991 and 1992	Karl Waters, Keystone Builders.	684-776 Grace Street	Single-Family Residential	15 units of small lot single-family residential with shared driveways. Proposed as 'affordable'.	Set-backs. Density? Lot size?
4	Hemlock Heights	1992?	Not known.	915-945 Hemlock Drive	Urban Residential	4 four-unit buildings for a total of 16 units.	Multiple buildings per parcel. Private road? NOT density.
August, 1994 New Zoning Code Adopted, with 'PUD' requirements and procedures.							
5	Heritage Woods (Some records say 'Heritage Heights'...) (AKA "Lot 1 of CSM 5752")	1994	Larry Turner, Discovery Group. Marty Bethke property-owner.	401-439 Cross Country Road	Mixed Residential (duplex)	10 duplex buildings for a total of 20 dwelling units.	Number of buildings on a lot. Private road? NOT density.
6	Jenna Court (AKA Fieldstone Ridge Condos) (AKA Ridge Addition to Westridge Estates—plat)	1996	David Roark, Village Homes LLC	810-837 Jenna Court	Mixed/Urban Residential	3 duplex and 4 four-unit residential buildings	Number of buildings on a lot.
7	Miller's Supermarket	1996	Carl Miller	210 South Main Street	Central Commercial	Commercial	Minutes state that there are 'multiple uses' on one site, thus requiring a PUD...
8	South Franklin Street Townhouses	1997	Marty Bethke	263-285 South Franklin Street	Urban Residential	Multi-Family. 12 units.	Set-backs? The original GDP did NOT exempt density. The amended GDP DID exempt density.
9	Enterprise Condominiums	1997	Chuck Elliot	502-634 Enterprise Circle	Urban Residential	Multi-Family	Private Road; Density;
10	Prairie Oaks Neighborhood— Phases 1 and 2	1997	Horizon Development	Addresses on Prairie Oaks Drive; Prairie Way Boulevard; (and part of North Edge Trail?)	Urban Residential and Suburban Commercial	SUBDIVISION Mixed-use subdivision with multi-family residential, commercial, and private streets.	Density; Set-Backs
11	Badger Prairie Neighborhood. (AKA First Addition to Badger Prairie Plat) (AKA Lot 32 of Badger Prairie Plat)	1998	Heinrichs developed-- Midland Homes constructed.	802--896 North Edge Trail	Community Residential	SUBDIVISION. "Entry Level" Single- Family housing. Maximum building sizes were imposed.	Lot sizes; Side-yard set-backs

Table 8-9—Continued
City of Verona Planned Unit Developments—1980-2008
See Map 8-3

Map 8-3 Reference Number	Common Name	Year	Name of Developer	Associated Addresses	Underlying Zoning	Description	Exemptions
12	Goldenrod Circle Neighborhood (AKA Lots 318-345 of East View Heights Sixth Addition)	1999	Jerry Heinrichs developed-- Simon Homes constructed.	510-543 Goldenrod Circle and 922-934 Harper Drive.	Neighborhood Residential/ Community Residential	SUBDIVISION. 28 Single-Family with smaller lots and street frontages. Also, 2 private streets.	Private Roads; Lot sizes; Lot widths; Set-backs
13	Prairie Crest Neighborhood (Not Including New Age Village)	1999	Monson	Meadowside, Prairie Heights Drive, Faircrest Court	Urban Residential and Suburban Office	SUBDIVISION. Multi-Family and Office Planned Community	Density;
14	New Age Village (Lots 3, 4, and 5 of the Prairie Crest Plat and PUD...)	1999-2005	Bill Roach	New Age Circle and New Age Way	Urban Residential	Age-restricted Multi- Family	Density; Set-Backs
15	Kettle Woods Neighborhood (AKA Lot 123 of Kettle Creek subdivision)	2000	Jerry Heinrichs	Kettle Woods Drive; Carter Court; Tamarack Way	Neighborhood Residential	SUBDIVISION. Single-Family	Width of public streets; Set-backs
16	Railroad Street/Depot Drive (AKA the "Alexander Project" on the former Brunsell site)	2001 and 2002	Alexander Company	301 South Main Street	Urban Residential and Urban/Central Commercial	Commercial and Multi-Family	Number of buildings per lot; number of uses per lot; density.
17	World of Variety	2003	Mike Mudler	118 South Main	Central Commercial	Commercial	
18	Prairie Oaks Neighborhood— Phase Three	2005	Horizon Development	To be determined— Not yet built.	Urban Residential	SUBDIVISION Multi-family residential.	Density; Set-backs.
19	Hometown View Hometown Ridge (AKA Lot 68 of Hawthorne Hills)	2005	Chuck Elliot and Chuck Buell	861-871 Kimball Lane (apartments) and 845 Kimball Lane (townhouses)	Urban Residential	Two apartments (Hometown View) and 94 townhouses (Hometown Ridge)	Number of buildings per lot. Private roads. Building separation.
20	To be Named (AKA Lot 36, Harmony Hills)	2006	John Brigham and Vierbicher and Associates.	To be determined— Not yet built	Mixed Residential and Urban Residential	35 dwelling units in 2, 3 and 4-unit buildings accessed via a private street.	Number of buildings per lot. Private street. NOT density.
21	City Centre	2006	David Keller and Jim Burke	310-318 South Main Street	Urban Residential and Central Commercial	One Multi-Family and One Commercial building.	Setbacks.
2005-2007. Proposed 'Big Box' zoning rules—as recommended by the 'Large Scale Retail Task Force—are defeated by the Council. In the absence of rules specific to 'big box' developments, several Council members suggest requiring any proposed 'big box' development to be reviewed as a Planned Unit Development. Staff begins requiring any proposals that include large retail buildings to be reviewed as planned unit developments.							
22	West End	2007	T. Wall Properties	To be determined— Not yet built.	Suburban Commercial	SUBDIVISION. Commercial subdivision with some residential.	Buildings per parcel; Set-backs; Private streets.
23	Hometown Circle	2007	Enterprise Drive LLC	To be determined— Not yet built	Suburban Commercial	SUBDIVISION. Commercial subdivision.	None.
2008— City ordinances revised to require any commercial proposal with more than 100,000 square feet of retail to be reviewed as a PUD.							

Section Three--Existing Conditions and Analysis—Perimeter Area

Note—The perimeter area also includes portions of the Towns of Montrose and Springdale. The following section only provides data for the Town of Verona portion of the perimeter area included in this City of Verona Comprehensive Plan Chapter 8...

Section Three—Sub-Section 1—Amount, type, intensity, and density of existing land uses—Perimeter Area

Table 8-10: Town of Verona Summary of Generalized Land Uses: 1970-2000

Acres of Land Use	1970	1980	1990	2000			1970-2000	
				Total	Percent of Developed Area ¹	Percent of Total	Total	Percent Change
Residential	618.8	957.8	917.2	1,350.0	35.6%	7.2%	731.2	118.2%
Business	58.9	123.3	169.2	255.4	6.7%	1.4%	196.5	333.6%
Public	1,117.0	1,117.1	1,898.1	2,189.9	57.7%	11.8%	1,072.9	96.1%
Developed Total ¹	1,794.7	2,198.2	2,984.5	3,795.2	100.0%	20.4%	2,000.5	111.5%
Undeveloped Total ¹	20,403.1	19,135.7	17,945.5	14,834.8		79.6%	-5,568.3	-27.3%
Town Total	22,197.8	21,333.9	20,930.0	18,630.1		100.0%	-3,567.7	-16.1%

Source: Capital Area Regional Planning Commission
Note 1—See explanation below regarding use of the term ‘developed’ in this table and how the term ‘developed’ is used elsewhere in this comprehensive plan.

As indicated in [Table 8-10](#), the Town of Verona included 18,630 acres of land in 2000. Note that this amount is *less* than in previous years. This decrease is attributed to the annexation of Town of Verona lands to the adjacent incorporated municipalities of Madison and Verona. Of the 18,630 acres of land—3,795 acres was considered by the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission to be ‘developed’.

NOTE: [Table 8-10](#) reflects that the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission does *not* consider agricultural lands to be ‘developed’. As described elsewhere in this chapter, the City of Verona and this Comprehensive Plan classifies lands in the planning area as either A) ‘natural’ or B) ‘developed’—with developed lands being further classified into three sub-categories: 1) rural development—including agricultural lands; 2) low-intensity urban development—including primarily residential development not on utilities; and 3) high-intensity urban development—including development on utilities. The remainder of this section analyzing amount, type, intensity, and density of existing land-uses within the Perimeter Area will utilize the CARPC definition of ‘developed’—and not the definition used throughout the remainder of this comprehensive plan—to avoid confusion when examining [Table 8-10](#).

Of the 3,795 acres of developed land in the Town of Verona in 2000, over a third (35%) was classified as residential while only about 7% was classified as ‘businesses’. The remainder was classified as ‘public’ developed land, including about 1,100 acres of street right-of-way. CARPC classified 14,834 acres of land in the Town of Verona as ‘Undeveloped’ in 2000, which included primarily agricultural lands (considered by the City of Verona as ‘Rural Development’...) or ‘natural’ lands with neither rural nor urban development (considered by the City of Verona as ‘Undeveloped’...).

Section Three—Sub-Section 2—Density of Residential Land Uses—Perimeter Area

Table 8-11: Town of Verona Residential Land Use: 1970 to 2000							
Data Item	1970	1980	1990	2000	1970-2000 Change		2005 est.
					Number	Percent	
Total Population	2,235	2,259	2,137	2,153	-82.0	-4%	2,037
Population in Group Quarters	589	340	257	117	-472.0	-80%	82
Household Population	1,646	1,919	1,880	2,036	390.0	24%	1,955
<i>Persons Per Housing Unit</i>	3.67	2.99	2.80	2.53	-1.1	-31%	2.25
Total Housing Units	448	642	671	804	356	79%	867
1-Family Housing (units)	356	528	560	699	743	127%	760
2+ Family Housing (units)	92	114	111	105	-12	-37%	107
Total Residential Acreage	618.8	957.8	917.2	1,350.0	731.2	118%	1,380.5
1-Family Residential (acres)	587.1	932.3	878.3	1,329.9	742.8	127%	1,376.2
2+ Family Residential (acres)	31.7	25.5	38.9	20.1	-11.6	-37%	4.3
Residential Net Density	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6	-0.1	-18%	0.6
1-Family Net Residential Density	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	-0.1	-13%	0.6
2+ Family Net Residential Density	2.9	4.5	2.9	5.2	2.3	80%	24.9
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and Dane County Regional Planning Commission							

As shown in [Table 8-11](#), the 1,350 acres of residential land in the Town of Verona include *only* single-family or duplex housing units. The Town of Verona provides no multi-family housing, although in 2000 there was one ‘Group Quarters’ facility in the township that provided housing for 117 people. Note, however, that after 2000 this facility was annexed into the City of Verona and replaced in 2008 by the Hometown Circle commercial development. As a result—there are currently no multi-family or group-quarters residential units within the perimeter planning area.

For lands classified by CARPC as ‘residential’ within the perimeter planning area, average density of residential development is 1.68 units per acre. In an urbanizing area such as Dane County, such residential density is insufficient to adequately accommodate anticipated population growth (See Chapters 1 and 2...). In rural areas lower residential density is to be expected because housing has historically been *accessory* to rural land-uses—such as crop farming or dairy production—and so such housing consumed small amounts of land relative to the primary use of the land. In recent decades, however, residential development in the perimeter planning area has been allowed that is *not* accessory to rural land-uses but is rather the primary use of the land. This housing has been allowed primarily on lots between 1 and 10 acres in size and has either no or little farming, mining, or other traditional rural land-uses associated with the housing. The City of Verona plans to allow new residential development within the perimeter area only if it is accessory to agricultural or similar rural land-uses through the use of current extraterritorial plat approval requirements in an effort to a) maintain rural areas and to b) direct new residential development to more dense urban areas. Such an approach makes sense in an urbanizing area such as the Verona Area because higher densities are required to accommodate population growth in a responsible and environmentally-sensitive manner and because efforts must be made to preserve rural areas and minimize land-use conflicts between agricultural land-uses and non-farm residential development in unincorporated areas. Furthermore, the City of Verona is able to provide housing options beyond just single-family and duplex housing to meet a wider variety of residential needs.

Section Three—Sub-Section 3—Detailed amount, type, and intensity of land uses—Perimeter Area

Table 8-12: Town of Verona Detailed Land Uses: 1970-2000

Acres of Land Use	1970 Total	1980 Total	1990 Total	2000			1970-2000	
				Total	Percent of Developed Area	Percent of Total	Total	Percent Change
Single Family	587.1	932.3	878.3	1,329.9	35.0%	7.1%	742.8	126.5%
Two Family	3.0	8.6	11.8	4.1	0.1%	0.0%	1.1	36.7%
One & Two Family	590.1	940.9	890.1	1,334.0	35.1%	7.2%	743.9	126.1%
Multi Family & Other	28.7	16.9	27.1	16.0	0.4%	0.1%	-12.7	-44.3%
Commercial Retail & Services	22.4	18.0	11.4	29.5	0.8%	0.2%	7.1	31.7%
Industrial	36.5	105.3	157.8	225.9	6.0%	1.2%	189.4	518.9%
Street Rights-of-way	731.1	712.9	768.4	1,048.8	27.6%	5.6%	317.7	43.5%
Transport, Com. & Utilities	123.6	142.2	31.4	117.9	3.1%	0.6%	-5.7	-4.6%
Institutional & Governmental	102.9	81.0	84.5	64.0	1.7%	0.3%	-38.9	-37.8%
Outdoor Recreation	159.4	181.0	1,013.8	959.2	25.3%	5.1%	799.8	501.8%
Developed Area	1,794.7	2,198.2	2,984.5	3,795.2	100.0%	20.4%	2,000.5	111.5%
Vacant, Unused Lands	NA	87.2	29.4	120.9				
Woodlands	NA	1,762.8	1,932.8	2,094.4				
Other Open Lands	NA	531.9	815.3	1,234.8				
Water	NA	67.5	33.2	109.2				
Cropland & Pasture	NA	16,686.3	15,134.8	11,275.3				
Undeveloped Area	20,403.1	19,135.7	17,945.5	14,834.8		79.6%	5,568.3	-27.3%
Town Total	22,197.8	21,333.9	20,930.0	18,630.1		100.0%	3,567.7	-16.1%

Source: Dane County Regional Planning Commission

Table 8-13: Town of Verona Generalized Land Uses: 1970-2005

Acres of Land Use	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005			1980-2005	
					Total	Percent of Developed Area	Percent of Total	Total	Percent Change
Residential	618.8	957.8	917.2	1,350.0	1,380.5	39.6%	8.2%	422.7	44.1%
Business	58.9	123.3	169.2	255.4	262.9	7.5%	1.6%	139.6	113.3%
Transportation	731.1	775.3	789.1	1,144.1	1,080.1	31.0%	6.4%	304.8	39.3%
Public, except Transportation	385.9	341.8	1,109.0	1,045.8	763.8	21.9%	4.5%	422.0	123.5%
Developed Area	1,794.7	2,198.2	2,984.5	3,795.2	3,487.3	100.0%	20.6%	1,289.1	58.6%
Undeveloped Area	20,403.1	19,135.7	17,945.5	14,834.8	13,435.2		79.4%	-5,700.5	-29.8%
Town Total	22,197.8	21,333.9	20,930.0	18,630.1	16,922.5		100.0%	-4,411.4	-20.7%

Source: Dane County Regional Planning Commission (1970-2000) and Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (2005)

Section Three—Sub-Section 4—Land Use Changes Since 2000—Perimeter Area

Since 2000, there have been few land-use changes in the perimeter area beyond A) annexations to adjacent incorporated municipalities (Madison and Verona...) and B) minor land divisions to accommodate low-density, non-farm residential development. A summary of annexations to the City of Verona are included in [Table 8-7](#). A summary of minor land-divisions for low-density, non-farm residential development is provided below in [Table 8-14](#).

Table 8-14: 2000-2008 Land Divisions - Town of Verona																					
	Parcels Created by Subdivision	Parcels Created by Certified Survey Map										Total Parcels Created									Grand Total
	2000 through 2008	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008		
Town of Verona	0	9	11	9	16	4	12	8	16	14	9	11	9	16	4	12	8	16	14	99	
Source: Dane County Department of Planning and Development, CARPC																					
3/4/2009																					

As [Table 8-14](#) indicates, 99 new parcels were created in the Town of Verona between 2000 and 2008, or about 11 new parcels each year. (Note that the figures in [Table 8-14](#) are for the Town of Verona—which includes lands that are *outside* of the perimeter planning area...) All but a few of these new parcels were for low-intensity urban development in rural areas—primarily residential development on well and septic. In 2008, following the failure to consolidate the city and town into one government (See Chapter 7—Intergovernmental Relations...), the City of Verona revised its extraterritorial plat approval ordinances to limit new development within the city’s extraterritorial area to parcels larger than 35 acres in size as a means to preserve rural areas and protect agriculture from non-farm development in rural areas. This City of Verona policy is expected to diminish the number of land-divisions for low-density urban development within the perimeter planning area in the coming years.

In addition to land-divisions for low-density urban development in the perimeter area since 2000, additional land-use changes in the perimeter area since 2000 include: A) In 2005 a controversial gravel quarry was granted the required County permits to operate in the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 26 (Herfel Quarry); B) the Bruce Company began operating a construction-materials recycling facility in the southwest intersection of Range Trail and CTH ‘M’ in the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 27 in 2007; and C) Maple Leaf landscaping constructed a facility at Spring Rose and U.S.H. 18-151.

Section Three—Sub-Section 5—Analysis of annexations—Perimeter Area

See “Section 2-5” (above) for details regarding annexations in the perimeter area.

Note that Section 2-5 does *not* include information regarding annexations in the Perimeter Area to the City of Madison or the City of Fitchburg.

Section Three—Sub-Section 6—Analysis of trends in the supply, demand and price of land—Perimeter Area

Table 8-15: Town of Verona Detailed Land Uses: 1970-2005

Acres of Land Use	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005			1980-2005	
					Total	Percent of Developed Area	Percent of Total	Total	Percent Change
RESIDENTIAL	618.8	957.8	917.2	1,350.0	1,380.5	39.6%	8.2%	422.7	44.1%
Single Family	263.9	630.8	633.0	1,329.9	1,376.2				
Two Family	3.0	8.6	11.8	4.1	1.7				
Multi Family	4.7	2.6	8.6	2.1	0.1				
Farm Dwelling	323.2	301.5	245.3	0.0	0.0				
Group Quarters	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Mobile Home	24.0	14.3	18.5	13.9	2.5				
INDUSTRIAL	36.5	105.3	157.8	225.9	240.7	6.9%	1.4%	135.4	128.6%
Manufacturing	36.5	3.6	3.8	3.2	1.8				
Wholesale	0.0	1.3	19.6	20.2	39.1				
Extractive (2)	NA	100.4	134.4	202.5	199.8				
TRANSPORTATION	731.1	775.3	789.1	1,144.1	1,080.1	31.0%	6.4%	304.8	39.3%
Right of Way	731.1	712.9	768.4	1,048.8	990.0				
Railroad (3)	NA	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Other	NA	12.4	20.7	95.3	90.1				
COMMUNICATION/UTILITIES	123.6	79.8	10.7	22.6	13.8	0.4%	0.1%	-66.0	-82.7%
Generating Processing	NA	0.2	0.0	7.8	3.6				
Transmission	NA	0.3	2.3	14.0	10.2				
Waste Processing	NA	79.0	8.4	0.8	0.0				
Other	NA	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0				
COMMERCIAL RETAIL	6.9	10.9	6.5	9.4	8.4	0.2%	0.0%	-2.5	-22.9%
General Repair & Maintenance	NA	4.5	0.0	0.6	0.6				
Transportation Related	NA	4.0	0.9	1.6	0.6				
Other	NA	2.4	5.6	7.2	7.2				
COMMERCIAL SERVICES	15.5	7.1	4.9	20.1	13.8	0.4%	0.1%	6.7	94.4%
Lodging	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Other	15.5	7.1	4.9	20.1	13.8				
INSTITUTIONAL/GOVERNMENTAL	102.9	81.0	84.5	64.0	28.4	0.8%	0.2%	-52.6	-64.9%
Education	NA	5.0	8.4	3.7	0.0				
Administrative	NA	2.4	0.0	1.1	1.2				
Cemetery	NA	15.2	14.7	0.0	0.0				
Other	NA	58.4	61.4	59.1	27.2				
OUTDOOR RECREATION (3) (4)	159.4	181.0	1,013.8	959.2	721.6	20.7%	4.3%	540.6	298.7%
TOTAL DEVELOPED AREA	1,794.7	2,198.2	2,984.5	3,795.2	3,487.3	100.0%	20.6%	1,289.1	58.6%
AGRICULTURE & UNDEVELOPED	20,403.1	19,135.7	17,945.5	14,834.8	13,435.2		79.4%	-5,700.5	-29.8%
Woodlands (5)	NA	1,762.8	1,932.8	2,094.4	1,936.8			174.0	9.9%
Other Open Lands (5)	NA	531.9	815.3	1,234.8	2,221.8			1,689.9	317.7%
Vacant Unused Lands (5)	NA	87.2	29.4	120.9	61.3			-25.9	-29.7%
Water	34.8	67.5	33.2	109.2	70.5			3.0	4.4%
Cropland & Pasture (5)	NA	16,686.3	15,134.8	11,275.3	9,144.8			-7,541.5	-45.2%
TOTAL AREA	22,197.8	21,333.9	20,930.0	18,630.1	16,922.5		100.0%	-4,411.4	-20.7%
(1) Farm Dwellings were counted under the single family residential category in 2000.									
(2) Extractive was not separately classified as industrial in 1970.									
(3) The railroad rights-of-way was converted from rail to trail after 1980.									
(4) Dane County and DNR lands were classified as "outdoor recreation" after the 1980 land use inventory.									
(5) Undeveloped land was not classified into four categories until after 1970, therefore the change is shown from 1980 to 2000.									
Source: Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (1970-2000)									

Section Four—Land Use Projections

Table 8-16: Minimum Land Needs to Meet Population, Housing & Employment Targets								
Land Use Category (in acres)	Existing 2000 (acres)	Existing 2005 (acres)	Future 2030 (acres)	Percent of Developed Total	Number of Persons	Persons Per Housing Unit	Number of Housing Units	Housing Units Per Acre
Low-density, Single-Family	552.6	711.5	1,641.5	34.8%	18,507	3.10	5,970	3.64
Mid-density, Two-Family	34.6	43.5	108.5	2.3%	1,449	1.75	828	7.63
One and Two Family	587.2	755.0	1,750.0	37.1%	19,957	2.94	6,798	3.88
High-density, Multifamily	46.8	95.1	230.1	4.9%	3,918	1.30	3,014	13.10
Residential Land Uses	634.0	850.1	1,980.1	42.0%	23,875	2.43	9,813	4.96
Industrial	74.7	103.9	242.6	5.1%	Number of Jobs	Number of Jobs per Acre	Number of Employers	Number of Jobs per Employer
Commercial	116.9	216.7	506.2	10.7%				
Government & Institutional	147.2	196.3	458.4	9.7%				
Employment Land Uses	338.8	516.9	1,207.2	25.6%	15,633	12.95	1,203	13.0
Street right-of-way	371.3	528.1	1,219.8	25.9%				
Transportation & Utilities	22.8	23.7	54.7	1.2%				
Outdoor Recreation	78.5	110.6	255.5	5.4%				
Public Land Uses	472.6	662.4	1,529.9	32.4%				
Developed Land Total	1,445.4	2,029.3	4,717.2	100%				
Undeveloped Land Total	741.4	1,011.0	2,365.7					
City Land Total	2,186.8	3,040.3	7,082.9					
Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census (2000), Wisconsin Dept. of Administration (2006), Capital Area Regional Planning Commission: 2005 and City of Verona. The assumptions used in this table include the following: a 3.8% annual growth rate, 2.43 persons per housing unit and 4.96 housing units per acre.								

Table 8-16 projects how much land will be needed over the time period covered by this Plan to accommodate projected growth as determined in Chapter 1 (See Table 1-13b). The next section of this Chapter—Part 5 Future Plans—will explain *where* and *how* the lands outlined in Table 8-16 will be developed.

Section Five—Future Plans—Current City

Definition and Land Use Plan for the ‘Current City’ Area

Definition. Currently urbanized areas within the planning area are classified by this plan as either ‘high-intensity urban areas’ or ‘low-intensity urban areas’.

The ‘High Intensity Urban Area’ portion of the planning area is defined as the area that is included within the corporate limits of the City at the time this Plan is adopted. This Plan uses the term ‘Current High Intensity Urban Area’ interchangeably with ‘The Current City of Verona’ or ‘The Current City’. Please see **Map 8-2** for a depiction of this current High Intensity Urbanized/Current City area. This Section 5 presents plans for the future of what is currently the city. Section 6—below—presents plans for areas that are not included within the Current City but which are included in ‘perimeter area’ of the City of Verona comprehensive plan.

At the time this plan is written, the City of Verona encompasses 155,615,922 square feet of land, or 5.58 square miles. Within the bounds of the City’s corporate limits, most areas are currently urbanized and municipal water and sewer service is available.

Note that while some portions of the ‘High Intensity Urban Area’ have not yet urbanized, they are still considered to be part of the current ‘High Intensity Urban Area’. These areas have been annexed into the city but urban development has not yet occurred. The next section provides plans for these areas that area awaiting urban development within the current City of Verona.

Section Five—Sub-Section 1—Land Use Plan for *Non-Urbanized Areas* within the Current City of Verona.

A portion of lands within the current city has not urbanized, as outlined in [Table 8-8](#). This section describes the land use plan for these ‘yet-to-urbanize’ lands. Following this section is a full land use plan for the (already urbanized...) downtown area of the city.

Urban development is anticipated in the near-term for the following non-urbanized areas within the city, unless such development is permanently constrained by environmental conditions:

- A) The Reinke/Darrow properties which together occupy all of the southeast quarter of Section 23...;
- B) The southern portions of the Scenic Ridge and Cathedral Point subdivisions (formerly Acker and Witt farms) located in the south half of the northeast quarter of Section 27...;
- C) The Erbach farm located in the northwest and southwest quarters of the northeast quarter of Section 21...;
- D) The southern portion of the West End development (formerly Thompson Farm) located in the eastern half of the northwest quarter of Section 21;
- E) The Matt’s/Bice property located in the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 22...; and
- F) The Davis Farm located in the northwest and southwest quarters of the northwest quarter of Section 25 and also in the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 25....
- G) The Cross Point (Pollow Farm) subdivision in the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 16;

See [Map 4-2](#) for the location of these lands.

Please see [Table 8-17](#) for an outline of these non-urbanized areas that are already included in the current City of Verona, including their status in terms of urban development review and approval and the anticipated uses for each of these properties.

Table 8-17 (See Also Table 8-8): ‘Non-Urbanized Areas’ within the ‘High Intensity Urban Area’ (City Limits at time of adoption)

Property	Approximate Location	Year Annexed	Acres	Development Approvals in Place	Anticipated Uses	Development Timing
Reinke/Darrow	S.E. ¼ of Section 23	1998	100	In USA Not platted Not zoned	Non-residential Non-retail	Not begun. Expected within 5 years.
Matt’s/Bice	N.E. ¼ of S.W. ¼ of Section 22	2003	N/A	In USA Not platted Not zoned	Floodplain	N/A
Cross Point (Pollow)	N.W. and N.E. ¼ of N.W. ¼ of Section 16	2004	50	In USA Platted Zoned	Residential	Phased development has begun.
Scenic Ridge (Acker)	S.E. ¼ of N.W. ¼ of Section 27	2005	92	In USA Platted Zoned	Residential	Phased development has begun.
Cathedral Point (Witt)	S.E. and S.W. 1/4s of the N.E. ¼ of Section 27	2005	149	In USA Platted Zoned	Residential	Phased development has begun.
Erbach Farm	N.E. and S.E. ¼ of N.E. ¼ of Section 21	2006	80	In USA Not platted Not zoned	Mixed-use, primarily commercial	Not begun. Expected within approximately 10-15 years.
The West End (Thompson)	S.E. ¼ of N.W. ¼ of Section 21	2006	62	In USA Platted Zoned	Mixed-use, primarily commercial	Phased development has begun.
Davis Farm	N.W. and S.W. 1/4s of N.W. ¼ of Section 25 and N.W. ¼ of S.W. ¼ of Section 25	2006	111	Not in USA Not platted Not zoned	Industrial	Not begun. Expected within 10 years.

Section Five—Sub-Section 2—Land Use Plan for *Downtown*

A primary goal for the City of Verona is to preserve and enhance the downtown area as a strong and viable commercial, service, and entertainment center. The plan to accomplish these goals for the downtown area of the City of Verona is included in [Appendix 8-A](#).

Section Six—Future Plans—Perimeter Area

Organization of Section Six:

- 1. Definition of the ‘Perimeter’ Area & Classification of Existing Uses within the Perimeter Area**
- 2. Land Use Plan for *future urban areas* within the ‘Perimeter’ Area**
- 2A. ‘Southwest Neighborhood’ Plan for future urban growth within portions of the ‘south’ and all of the ‘southwest’ *future urban area***
- 3. Land Use Plan for *future rural areas* within the ‘Perimeter’ Area**

This Section Six of Chapter 8 provides the City of Verona’s land-use plans for the Perimeter Area.

Section Six—Sub-Section 1—Definition and Classification of Existing Uses for the ‘Perimeter Area’

Definition. This plan calls the area surrounding the corporate limits of the City of Verona (at the time this plan is adopted...) the ‘perimeter area’. The perimeter area includes lands within 3 miles of the current city limits, except to the east—where the perimeter area extends to Fitchrona Road, and to the north, where the perimeter area extends to County Trunk Highway ‘PD’. See [Map 8-4](#) for the perimeter area used in this plan.

Note 1—Consistent with the intergovernmental agreement between the City of Verona and the City of Madison, the City of Madison has included the area south of Midtown Road and north of CTH ‘PD’ in the City of Madison comprehensive plan. The City of Verona land-use plan for that area defers to the City of Madison’s comprehensive plan for the area north of CTH ‘PD’. (See ‘Intergovernmental Cooperation—City of Madison—for additional information regarding the area north of CTH ‘PD’...)

Note 2—A portion of the Perimeter Area near the City of Fitchburg currently lies within the City of Fitchburg’s extraterritorial plat approval jurisdiction (EPAJ—See Map 7-9). As described below, the City of Verona plans to grow to the east, and so has included lands to our east—including lands currently within the City of Fitchburg’s EPAJ—in this comprehensive plan. The City of Fitchburg will control land-divisions within its EPAJ until such time that the City of Verona has grown to either a) include these lands within the Verona EPAJ or b) annex these lands into the City of Verona.

As described earlier in this chapter, most lands within the perimeter area are currently either:

- a) Developed for rural land uses—primarily agriculture but with isolated examples of quarries, one sanitary land-fill, and similar rural land-uses;
- b) Developed with low-intensity urbanization—primarily residential but with isolated examples of commercial (such as Sharer Cycle Center on ‘PD’), institutional (such as several churches), and industrial (such as Kelsch Machine Corp. on ‘PB’ at 69) land-uses; or
- c) Undeveloped/natural—particularly in areas prone to flooding and in forested areas that have never been cleared for agriculture.

Table 8-17: Summary Table of Land-Use Classifications for the Perimeter Area	
Classification	Current Development (Quarter-Quarters)
Exclusively Rural	Undeveloped areas or rural land-uses only * within a quarter-quarter.
Predominantly Rural	Primarily undeveloped areas or rural land uses with 3 or fewer parcels of low intensity urban development * within a quarter-quarter
Predominantly LI Urban	Mix of 4 or more parcels with low-intensity urban development and additionally some rural land uses within a quarter-quarter.
Exclusively LI Urban	Only low-intensity urban land-uses with no or with minimal rural land uses within a quarter-quarter.
* <u>Note</u> : Up to 2 housing units which are <i>accessory to a rural land use</i> (See Definitions section...) located on the same parcel as a rural land-use (or on a 'parent' rural-use parcel...) are considered 'rural'.	

Table 8-17 shows the four classifications of land-uses for the Perimeter Area and provided definitions for each. Map 8-4 also shows these current land-classifications within the Perimeter Area. Appendix 8-B (Perimeter Area Existing Land Use Classification Tables) provides a complete list of the 'current land-use classification' for each quarter-quarter section within the perimeter area as described in Table 8-17 and as shown on Map 8-4.

Perimeter Area Plan—Two Parts.

The Perimeter Area as shown on Map 8-4 is divided into two broad areas for purposes of future planning—the 'Future Urban Area' (Future City Growth Area) and the 'Rural and Farmland Preservation Area'.

Future Urban—Future City Growth Area—The areas within three miles of the city's limits at the time this plan is adopted that are expected or are likely to annex into the City of Verona and urbanize with either high-intensity or low-intensity urban development during the time covered by this plan. These portions of the Perimeter Area are called the 'Future Urban or Future City Growth Areas' and are divided into 6 sub-areas: North, East, Southeast, South, Southwest, and North of CTH 'PD'. These areas are shown on Map 8-5 and described in more detail in the following Section 6-2 below.

Note that in the summer of 2009—the City of Verona adopted a neighborhood plan which provides details for portions of the 'South' and the entirety of the 'Southwest' 'Future City Growth Areas'. This plan is called the 'Southwest Neighborhood Plan, and a complete copy of this adopted plan—which is incorporated into this comprehensive plan as part of this Land Use chapter—is available in Appendix 8-C.

Rural and Farmland Preservation Area—The areas within three miles of the city's limits at the time this plan is adopted that are *not* expected or are unlikely to annex to the City of Verona and urbanize during the time covered by this plan. This portion of the Perimeter Area is called the 'Rural and Farmland Preservation Area'. This area is shown on Map 8-6 and is described in more detail in Section 6-3 below.

Section Six—Sub-Section 2—Land Use Plan for Future City of Verona Urban Areas

As indicated on [Table 8-16](#), the City of Verona will need approximately 7,080 acres of land to accommodate anticipated population growth and the associated residential, commercial, and industrial development.

According to [Table 8-16](#)—the City of Verona included approximately 3,040 acres of land as of 2005. As indicated in [Table 8-7](#), since 2005 the City of Verona has annexed an additional 470 acres of land, including:

- 34 acres in Hometown Village
- 111 acres in the ‘Davis Farm’
- 2 acres along West Verona Avenue for the West End project
- 14 acres of the ‘Peterson’ property
- 6 acres of ‘County land’ on East Verona Avenue, and
- 1 acre of ‘Graves site’ at West Verona Avenue and Nine Mound
- 302 acres of DOT right-of-way and Dane County parklands (non-developable...)

At the time this plan is written—the City of Verona includes a total of 3,510 acres of land. The net additional land that the City of Verona will need to accommodate future City of Verona growth is 3,570 acres (7,080 less 3,510 acres of land included in the city at the time this plan is written...).

Lands that are within the perimeter area with the highest likelihood of being annexed into the city during the time period covered by this plan (2010 through 2030) and urbanized are shown on [Map 8-5](#) (Future Urban Growth). This map shows 6 areas where the City of Verona believes that at least 3,570 acres of appropriate land exists to reasonably and efficiently accommodate future urban growth as projected. These areas are:

- North— North of the current city limits to CTH ‘PD’ and west of the city limits to Country View;
East— East of the current city limits to Fitchrona Road;
Southeast— South of CTH ‘M’ to Sunset Drive on the south and CTH ‘PB’ on the west;
South— South of the current city limits with CTH ‘PB’ on the east and the Badger Mill Creek/Sugar River on the west. See [Appendix 8-C](#) for detailed plans for the portion of the ‘South’ area that are included in the ‘Southwest Neighborhood Plan’ portion of this chapter of this comprehensive plan.
Southwest— South of the current city limits with Badger Mill Creek on the east and the Sugar River on the west and south. See [Appendix 8-C](#) for detailed plans for this area as provided in the ‘Southwest Neighborhood Plan’ portion of this chapter of this comprehensive plan.
North of PD—North of CTH ‘PD’ and west of the section line dividing sections 8 and 9 and dividing sections 4 and 5 in the Town of Verona.

This map shows 3,900 acres of land—based on quarter-quarter sections—that the City of Verona believes are most likely to and most logical for annexation into the City and urbanization.

Please note the following important points regarding [Map 8-5](#)—Future Urban Growth Plan:

- 1) The City of Verona does not believe that *all* of these 3,900 acres of land will *necessarily* urbanize during the time period covered by this plan, (although population projections and land-requirement assumptions indicate that most of these lands will need to urbanize to accommodate projected growth...). Rather—the areas identified on this map are the lands that the City of Verona believes are *most likely* and *most logical* for accommodating expected City of Verona growth with dense urban development.

- 2) The City plans to continue to ‘grow from the edges’, meaning that those lands within these planning areas that are closest to/adjacent to the city today are most likely to annex/urbanize in the short-term, while those lands within these planning areas that are further away from the current city are most likely to annex/urbanize in the long-term. Note, however, that even those lands that are not expected to annex/urbanize in the short term need nonetheless to be preserved for future City of Verona growth and urban development...
- 3) In addition to ‘growing from the edges’ in all direction, the City believes dense urban growth to the north and east—toward existing urbanized areas in Madison and Fitchburg—should be encouraged. While the City will encourage dense urban growth to the north and east, the city also anticipates and is planning for dense urban growth to the south and west—away from the urban core of the County (Madison)—as well. (See ‘Rural Areas Preservation’, below...)
- 4) Because these ‘Future Urban Growth Areas’ are anticipated to annex into the city and develop with high-intensity or low-intensity urban development during the 20-year time period covered by this plan—the City will continue to utilize its extraterritorial authorities to prohibit land-divisions within these areas until such time as these areas are annexed into the City.
- 5) The city will seek to avoid/minimize forced annexations except in those rare instances in which a few owners of small parcels are preventing the orderly development of larger areas beyond (due to legislation preventing the creation of ‘town islands’...). Other than this rare exception, property owners within the Future Urban Growth planning areas who wish to remain in the township, deed restrict their land, or otherwise limit development of their land are entitled to do so. (Note that when such lands are eliminated from accommodating urban development—*other* lands will become necessary to accommodate urban growth...)
- 6) Following from the previous note, based on property-owner preferences and market conditions—City of Verona growth will not necessarily occur in all directions at equal rates, but rather may occur more quickly or more slowly within each of the Future Urban Growth planning areas. For example—if property owners in the ‘South’ planning area do not wish to have their lands annexed for City of Verona growth for many years, *other* planning areas may develop more quickly than the ‘South’ planning area (or may develop completely before the ‘South’ planning area would begin to urbanize...)
- 7) It is not the intent of this map to split the property of any particular land-owner between the anticipated future City of Verona Urban Growth areas and the Rural Preservation portions of the perimeter area beyond the Future Growth areas. If the map does so split a piece of property that is under one ownership—the property may be treated as a ‘whole’ and may be either included in or excluded from the Future Urban Growth planning area completely, based on the desires of the property owner.

Each of these City of Verona ‘Future Urban Growth’ areas is described in greater detail in the following section.

Section Six—Sub-Section 2—Land Use Plan for Future City of Verona Urban Areas (continued)**1) Area ‘North’**

Approximate Number of Total Acres (Gross)	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Natural Features	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Existing L.I. Development	Approximate Gross Developable Acres
1,100 acres	160 acres—Flood Plains and Ice Age Trail	40	900

2) Area ‘East’

Approximate Number of Total Acres (Gross)	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Natural Features	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Existing L.I. Development	Approximate Net Developable Acres
1,120 acres	0	20	1,100

3) Area ‘South-East’

Approximate Number of Total Acres (Gross)	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Natural Features	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Existing L.I. Development	Approximate Net Developable Acres
560	Kettle Moraine & Ice Age Trail	20	540

4) Area ‘South’

Approximate Number of Total Acres (Gross)	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Natural Features	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Existing L.I. Development	Approximate Net Developable Acres
680	120—Flood Plains & Ice Age Trail	80	480
See Appendix 8-C for detailed plans for the portion of the ‘South’ area that are included in the ‘Southwest Neighborhood Plan’.			

5) Area ‘South-West’

Approximate Number of Total Acres (Gross)	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Natural Features	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Right-of-Way	Approximate Net Developable Acres
440	100—Flood plains, expected U.S.A. environmental limitations	40	300
See Appendix 8-C for detailed plans for the portion of the ‘South-West’ area that are included in the ‘Southwest Neighborhood Plan’.			

6) Area ‘North of CTH PD’

Approximate Number of Acres Total	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Natural Features	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Right-of-Way	Approximate Gross Developable Acres
See Note	See Note	See Note	See Note
Note: See narrative below for additional information regarding this ‘North of CTH PD’ planning area.			

Totals:

Approximate Number of Total Acres (Gross)	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—Natural Features	Approximate Non-Developable Acres—ROW or Existing Development	Approximate Net Developable Acres
3,900	380	200	3,340

Section Six—Sub-Section 2—Land Use Plan for Future City of Verona Urban Areas (continued)

Future City of Verona Growth (High-Intensity and Low-Intensity Urban Areas)

The basic plan for the future growth of the City of Verona is to continue its historic, planned growth from the center-out by gradual ‘expansion at the edges’. This growth is expected to continue in all directions *except* where the Sugar River will continue to be a natural and logical ‘barrier’ for the growth of the City of Verona. By growing-out gradually at the edges, the City will be able to continue to provide utilities and/or services (such as police protection and street plowing) to city residents in a cost-effective manner.

As explained in the detailed summary of planned land-uses in these Future Urban Growth Areas, most of the areas are designated for future high-intensity urban development. These are the areas that the City of Verona expects will be annexed into the City and urbanize. Most of these areas are also anticipated to be included in the Verona Urban Service Area. One area—the southeast area—is also designated for possible future low-intensity urban development. The City of Verona expects this area to annex to the city to urbanize but without being added to the Verona Urban Service Area.

Note that in most of these Future Urban Growth Areas—which are expected to be annexed into the City—the current land classification (**Map 8-4—Perimeter Area Existing Land Use Classification Map**) is either ‘Exclusively Rural’ or ‘Predominantly Rural’. In these areas, the existing rural land-uses will continue until such time that the land can be annexed and urbanized. *The City of Verona’s land-use goal is to preserve farmland until such time that it is needed to accommodate population growth—and to then annex land to accommodate population growth within incorporated areas through dense development. Such dense development, in turn, minimizes the amount of land that is required for urban growth and preserves the greatest amount of farm land and rural areas.*

Note that in some Future Urban Growth Areas—future urbanization is planned adjacent to existing low-intensity urbanization. In these areas—the existing low-intensity urban development will continue both prior to and after high-intensity urbanization occurs.

After this comprehensive plan is finalized and adopted, and as city time and resources allow, the City will proceed with developing more detailed land-use plans and maps for each of the Future Urban Growth Areas, designating which environmental resources need to be preserved; land-uses; and probable/preferred locations for infrastructure such as storm water detention facilities, streets, and utilities.

Section Six—Sub-Section 2—Land Use Plan for Future City of Verona Urban Areas (continued)

North.

New Land Uses

The bulk of the ‘North’ Future Urban Growth area is primarily planned for residential development—except a) in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of CTH ‘M’ and ‘PD’, where the city envisions regional commercial land-uses; b) portions of the planning area that front onto county trunk highways ‘M’ or ‘PD’ where commercial development may be more appropriate; and c) the western portion of the ‘North’ Future Urban Growth area where expansions of the existing corporate campus are anticipated as well as commercial land-uses ancillary to the existing/expanded corporate campus on the city’s west side. Residential development is expected to include a mix of single-family housing and multi-family housing according to the recommendations of Chapter 2—Housing.

Existing Urban Development (Low-intensity...) to Remain

Existing low-intensity urban development—such as on Windswept Lane and Cross Country Circle—will remain. Flood plain areas and other environmental corridors (see ‘Opportunities, below...’) will also remain as undeveloped.

Opportunities

The ‘North’ Future Urban Growth area is one of two best potential areas for future City of Verona residential development (the other one being the ‘East’ planning area—see below...). Assuming sewer is provided to the MMSD interceptor to the north, this area can be easily served with city water and sewer service, is adjacent to the current city, and ‘fills in the gap’ between the urban areas of Verona to the south and Madison to the north.

The ‘North’ Future Urban Growth area will ultimately be the interface between the City of Verona and the City of Madison. An ‘area of separation’ along CTH ‘PD’ was established in the intergovernmental agreement between Madison and the City of Verona. The design of this ‘area of separation’—as well as urban development in this area—can help create a permanent distinction between the two cities.

A large wooded area in northeast and southeast quarters of the northeast quarter of Section 10 (labeled the ‘Glover’ 100 acre piece in the 2007 Dane County plat book...) presents an opportunity for woodland preservation—since it is a large wooded area and is also adjacent to the Ice Age Trail.

Challenges

Much of the ‘North’ Future Urban Growth area is a ‘closed basin’, meaning storm water accumulates in the lowest-lying area but does not drain from the area naturally via a creek or river. Urban development in this area will need to address this challenge.

In the western portion of the ‘North’ Future Urban Growth area—the flood plain for the ‘Dry Tributary to Badger Mill Creek’ will present challenges for future development. Much of this flood-plain is located where existing gravel extraction operations exist. The future urbanization of these gravel pits presents some opportunities—but the existence of flood plain areas will also present significant challenges.

Preventing the creation of a town island around Cross County Circle/Hula Drive/Stardust Trail may be a challenge in this Future Urban Growth area. (Note: This challenge illustrates the difficulty some laws present for promoting/encouraging good, efficient urban development as well as the need to prevent low-intensity urban development where future high-intensity urban development is probable in the long-term...)

Section Six—Sub-Section 2—Land Use Plan for Future City of Verona Urban Areas (continued)

East.

New Land Uses

Existing agricultural lands within the ‘East’ Future Urban Growth area are planned for two land-uses. First—lands closest to the U.S.H. 18-151 by-pass (in the western-most portion of the planning area...) are planned for non-residential land-uses such as office and business parks, corporate campuses, industrial parks, and similar uses. Moving east—lands further from the U.S.H. 18-151 by-pass are planned for residential land-uses. The transition between the non-residential uses planned closest to the by-pass and residential uses planned further east will need to be planned and designed carefully, including the transition between the planned industrial development on the ‘Reinke’ property (in the southwest quarter of Section 23...) and future development to the east.

Existing Urban Development (Low-intensity...) to Remain

The ‘East’ Future Urban Growth area contains very few existing homes relative to the size of the area (in other words—there is little existing low-intensity urban development...). The existing ‘Goose Lake’ area of the Town of Verona is located north of and adjacent to this planning area, and this area will remain unchanged by City of Verona plans.

Opportunities

In addition to the ‘North’ area, the ‘East’ Future Urban Growth area is the City of Verona’s best opportunity for future residential development, since it is relatively flat and can be easily served by City of Verona utilities—once the initial difficulty and expense of extending such services underneath U.S.H. 18-151 have been overcome.

Because the western portion of this Future Urban Growth area has such high visibility along 18-151 (and to help minimize noise impacts on residential development planned further east...)—high-profile office-type uses along the highway—similar to what exists along U.S. 14 in Middleton—are planned for this area.

Existing wetlands in the northern-most portion of the ‘East’ Future Urban Growth area present both opportunities and challenges. Residential development should be designed so that such wetlands are both protected and so they become residential development amenities.

As with the City of Madison, the City of Verona may wish to establish some type of ‘area of separation’ with the City of Fitchburg to the east.

Challenges

Currently—the interchange between East Verona Avenue and U.S. 18-151 is a ‘limited access’ interchange—with traffic only being able to enter the highway to *go* east or to exit the highway coming *from* the east. To capitalize on non-residential land-uses in this area as planned—this interchange should be expanded to a ‘full-access’ interchange similar to what Verona did in 2005 with the West Verona Avenue/18-151 interchange. Unfortunately—the presence of a sanitary landfill, wetlands and flood-plains in the vicinity of the East Verona Avenue/18-151 interchange will make such an expansion expensive if not impossible.

Section Six—Sub-Section 2—Land Use Plan for Future City of Verona Urban Areas (continued)

South East

New Land Uses

Residential land-uses are planned for the ‘South-East’ Future Urban Growth area, although limited amounts of non-residential development may be appropriate along the two county-trunk highways that are in or adjacent to this Future Urban Growth area—‘PB’ on the west and ‘M’ on the north and east.

The northern-most portion of the ‘South-East’ Future Urban Growth area has been identified by the city’s utility studies as being easily served by city water and sewer service. Other portions of this Future Urban Growth area—especially those areas south of the ‘Terminal Moraine’ that runs through this area—will be more difficult and/or expensive to serve with city utilities. (See [Appendices 4-B and 4-C](#) for more details...) Consequently—the city may wish to delay urban development in this area (in favor of urban growth in other planning areas...) until these difficulties can be overcome and/or these expenses can be justified. Alternatively, the city is considering utilizing low-intensity urban development—which does not require utility services—in this ‘South East’ Future Urban Growth area. (Note—Consistent with the City’s goal of allowing urban development in the Verona Area *only* within the corporate limits of the City of Verona—as outlined elsewhere in this chapter, such low-intensity urban development in the South East area would only be allowed *after* annexation into the City.)

Existing Urban Development (Low-intensity...) to Remain

The South East Future Urban Growth area is characterized by a significant amount of existing Low Intensity Urban Development, such as along Shady Bend and Sunset Drive, and this existing development is planned to remain.

Opportunities

Due to the topographical features in the South East Future Urban Growth area (such as the Terminal Moraine...), this area may present an opportunity for the City to diversify its housing stock through lower-density, urban development not serviced by utilities. Such development could provide ‘higher-end’ housing options that are not currently available within the City. If the city chooses to pursue such development in a portion of the South East Future Urban Growth area, increased densities would be required in other planning areas—or other portions of the South East planning area—to insure that minimum densities city-wide are maintained.

A corridor for the Ice Age Trail—between Prairie Moraine Park and the City of Fitchburg—will be preserved in this Future Urban Growth area as will kettles and their associated wetlands.

Challenges

Preventing the creation of a town island around Davis Drive/Shady Bend Road may be a challenge in this Future Urban Growth area. (Note: This challenge illustrates the difficulty some laws present for promoting/encouraging good, efficient urban development as well as the need to prevent low-intensity urban development where future high-intensity urban development is probable in the long-term...)

Section Six—Sub-Section 2—Land Use Plan for Future City of Verona Urban Areas (continued)

South

New Land Uses

Existing agricultural lands within the ‘South’ Future Urban Growth area are planned primarily for residential development. The only potential areas for non-residential development within the ‘South’ Future Urban Growth area are 1) at the intersection of Range Trail and CTH ‘M’—where the Bruce Company currently operates a construction materials recycling facility; or 2) along Highway ‘PB’ in the eastern-most portion of the planning area, including possibly south of the existing Kwik Trip gas station at ‘M’ and ‘PB’. A less likely potential location for non-residential development might be along Highway 69 (in the western-most portion of the planning area).

Existing Urban Development (Low-intensity...) to Remain

Two areas of existing low-intensity urban development will remain in the ‘South’ Future Urban Growth area—first in the ‘Manhattan Drive’ neighborhood in the western-most portion of this Future Urban Growth area and second in the various areas of low-intensity development along CTH ‘PB’ and Range Trail in the eastern-most portion of this Future Urban Growth area.

Opportunities

The South Future Urban Growth area primarily represents the potential for future residential development to accommodate expected population growth in the Verona area, with limited amounts of non-residential development—primarily commercial as opposed to industrial—possible. Also—this area is characterized by naturally-occurring non-metallic mineral deposits which present an opportunity for mining and quarry operations. While the City considers quarries to be a ‘rural’ land-use appropriate for un-incorporated areas, the City will consider allowing quarry operations within this South area (after annexation) as industrial land-uses subject to city review and approvals.

Challenges

If the city continues its historic informal policy to avoid urban development that requires lift-stations for sanitary sewer service—the ‘South’ Future Urban Growth area may not be urbanized until other Future Urban Growth areas (that do not require such lift stations—such as the ‘East’ planning area) are urbanized first.

The presence of the Badger Mill Creek in the western-most portion of this Future Urban Growth area presents challenges as well. Fortunately, the City has spent considerable sums of money and time to study this area and develop strategies for how this area can urbanize while minimizing impacts upon the Badger Mill Creek (See the [Appendices 4-H1 and 4-H2](#)).

Preventing the creation of a town island around Rolling Oaks Drive may be a challenge in this Future Urban Growth area. (Note: This challenge illustrates the difficulty some laws present for promoting/encouraging good, efficient urban development as well as the need to prevent low-intensity urban development where future high-intensity urban development is probable in the long-term...)

Section Six—Sub-Section 2—Land Use Plan for Future City of Verona Urban Areas (continued)

Southwest

New Land Uses

The southwest Future Urban Growth area is planned for non-residential development such as office, business, or light-industrial parks to capitalize on the proximity of this area to the full-access interchange with 18-151. Commercial/retail development will be limited and will be secondary to non-retail (and non-residential) urban development. It is not the goal of the city to have a major retail shopping center in this area.

Existing Environmental Corridors to Remain

Preservation areas for environmental protection will most likely be necessary closest to the Badger Mill Creek and Sugar River in this planning area. (See [Appendices 4-H1 and 4-H2](#)—‘Badger Mill Creek—Sugar River Area Study’ for more details.)

Opportunities

The presence of a full-access interchange between State Highway 69 and U.S.H. 18-151 in this Future Urban Growth area presents excellent opportunities for the city’s desire to continue encouraging non-residential development. Unfortunately—3 of the 4 ‘quadrants’ of this interchange are severely limited for urban development due to the presence of flood-plains. Only the southwestern ‘quadrant’ of this interchange is available for urban development, which is why the city has prioritized this quadrant for long-term future non-residential uses such as medical/health care and office/light-industrial development. Also—this area is characterized by naturally-occurring non-metallic mineral deposits which present an opportunity for mining and quarry operations. While the City considers quarries to be a ‘rural’ land-use appropriate for un-incorporated areas, the City will consider allowing quarry operations within this Southwest area (after annexation) as industrial land-uses subject to city review and approvals.

Challenges

The presence of the Badger Mill Creek and the Sugar River in this Future Urban Growth area presents challenges as well. Fortunately, the City has spent considerable sums of money and time to study this area and develop strategies for how this area can urbanize while minimizing impacts upon the surface waters and other natural resources in this Future Urban Growth area (See [Appendices 4-H1 and 4-H2](#)—‘Badger Mill Creek—Sugar River Area Study’ for more detailed plans for these areas.)

Section Six—Sub-Section 2—Land Use Plan for Future City of Verona Urban Areas (continued)

North of C.T.H. ‘PD’

The City of Verona and the City of Madison have an intergovernmental agreement that specifies that CTH ‘PD’ will be the southern limits of City of Madison growth and the northern limits of the City of Verona growth (See the ‘City of Madison’ section of Chapter 7—Intergovernmental Cooperation—for more information). The western limit of this agreement is the north-south section line between Sections 8 and 9 and between 4 and 5 in Township 6 North-Range 8 East (Town of Verona). West of that line, the intergovernmental agreement between the city’s of Madison and Verona is silent and does not preclude Madison from growing south of ‘PD’ nor Verona from growing north of ‘PD’. The City of Madison has planned for future City of Madison growth in this area to continue to utilize CTH ‘PD’ as the southern limit of Madison’s growth—despite the fact that there is no intergovernmental agreement requiring Madison to stay north of ‘PD’. See [Map 7-6](#) for current City of Madison plans for growth in this area.

During 2007 and 2008—as this comprehensive plan was being drafted—the City of Verona and the Town of Verona were attempting to consolidate these two municipalities into one city (See Chapter 7—Intergovernmental Cooperation—for more information.) City of Madison approval for the proposed consolidation would have been required for the consolidation to have been ultimately allowed by the State of Wisconsin (had it not been defeated by Town of Verona citizens). During negotiations with the City of Madison to seek their support for the proposed consolidation—the City and Town of Verona expressed an interest in working with the City of Madison on limiting the density of development within this ‘North of PD’ area—particularly those areas that are within the City of Madison’s planned future growth *and* within the Verona Area School District’s jurisdiction.

The City of Verona is keeping this ‘North of C.T.H. PD’ area in our comprehensive plan because—while efforts to consolidate the City and Town of Verona were defeated—the City still is interested in pursuing discussions with the City of Madison about the density and pace of development within this area.

Section Six—Sub-Section 3—Rural and Farmland Preservation Area

As shown on **Map 8-6**, beyond the City's 'Future Urban Growth Areas' (described in the preceding section...), the Perimeter Area for the City of Verona Comprehensive Plan covers the full extent of the lands that will be included in the city's extraterritorial jurisdiction, which is expected to extend 3 miles from the city's corporate limits (except in those areas where intergovernmental agreements or other incorporated municipalities limit this 3-mile radius.) This portion of the perimeter area that is beyond the 'Future Urban Growth Areas' is called the 'Rural and Farmland Preservation Area'. Note that this area is not called simply the 'Rural Preservation Area' or just the 'Farmland Preservation Area' but is rather called the 'Rural and Farmland Preservation Area', because it is the City's intent to preserve *both* the rural character of this area *and* to preserve farmland.

It is the City's intent to preserve both the rural character *and* to preserve farmland in this area through continued prohibitions against land divisions that would create parcels smaller than 35 acres in size (which are typically created to allow low-intensity urban development...) in this 'Rural and Farmland Preservation' area. One notable exception to this policy will be in unincorporated Paoli, where the City of Verona will work with land-owners and residents of that community to create policies that the City of Verona would administer to accommodate Paoli's growth through land-divisions within Paoli. Should the citizens of Paoli seek to incorporate and control land-divisions themselves, the City of Verona would be supportive of such efforts.

Section Seven—Goals, Objectives, and Policies for Chapter 8—Land Use

Land Use Goal One: Continue traditional land-use patterns for the city as the city grows.

Objective 1-A: Encourage downtown development and redevelopment.

Policy: Encourage obsolete commercial buildings to be either reused or redeveloped with new commercial and mixed-use developments in the downtown.

Policy: Encourage remaining vacant parcels in the downtown area to develop with new commercial and mixed-use developments.

Policy: Continue to consider proposals for higher-density housing in the downtown area.

See Also: Chapter 2—Housing

Policy: Explore the creation of additional off-street parking areas in the downtown.

Policy: Provide a variety of housing options, densities, and styles throughout the city.

See Also: Chapter 2—Housing

Objective 1-B: Direct new residential development to the ‘growing edge’ of the city.

Policy: Direct new residential subdivisions to areas along the city’s corporate limits through annexations and expansions of the city’s urban service area.

Policy: Maintain traditional levels of residential density as the city grows.

See Also: Chapter 2—Housing

Objective 1-C: Direct new non-retail commercial development to the ‘growing edge’ of the city.

Policy: Direct new non-retail commercial development to areas along the city’s corporate limits through annexations and expansions of the city’s urban service area.

See Also: Chapter 6—Economic Development.

Objective 1-D: Protect and preserve areas within the planning area but outside of the city for *rural* land-uses such as crop agriculture, mineral extraction, and animal-related land-uses until such areas can be developed with appropriate *urban* uses.

Policy: Prevent low-intensity urban development within the City’s extraterritorial jurisdiction.

Policy: Explore low-intensity urbanization within the city near areas of environmental sensitivity where high-intensity urbanization is not desired.

Land Use Goal Two: Prevent land-use conflicts

Objective 2-A: Direct urban development to areas designated for urbanization.

Policy: Continue to exercise extraterritorial plat approval jurisdiction to prevent low-intensity urbanization outside of the city limits within the planning area.

Objective 2-B: Utilize zoning within the city to prevent adjacent land-uses that are incompatible.

Policy: Encourage office and similar non-residential development adjacent to the USH 18-151 by-pass.

Land Use Goal Three: Protect the Environment

Objective 3-A: Continue to require adequate storm water management and other environmental protection measures for development.

Policy: Investigate the creation of a storm water utility to cover expenses for complying with storm water management requirements.

See Also: Chapter 4—Utilities and Community Facilities.

Land Use Goal Four: Create a vibrant and healthy urban downtown area.

Objective 4-A: Implement the ‘Downtown Plan’ as outlined in Chapter 8.

Policy: Work with residents, owners of businesses, and other stakeholders in planning for the future growth of a vibrant/healthy commercial city center.

Objective 4-B: Encourage new development and redevelopment in the downtown area.

Policy: Encourage in-fill development

Policy: Encourage the reuse of existing buildings for new uses

Policy: Encourage appropriate redevelopment in the downtown

Appendices

8-A Downtown Verona Plan

8-B Perimeter Area “Existing Land-Use Classification” tables

8-C ‘Southwest Neighborhood’ Plan